

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 20 (legislative day of February 17), 1928

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Norman A. Dodge to be United States attorney, northern district of Texas.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

George A. Mauk to be United States marshal, district of Arizona.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Anna L. Monroe, Ferndale.
Dwight E. Knapp, Garberville.
Herma L. McBain, Hamilton City.
May C. Baker, Paradise.

FLORIDA

Thomas J. Bulford, Hilliard.

IOWA

Wilbur F. Busby, Creston.
Alvah S. Dukes, Unionville.

NEBRASKA

Edgar W. Meth, Arthur.

NORTH CAROLINA

William H. Manning, Bethel.
Abner W. Smith, Boone.
George E. Kestler, Concord.
May C. Campbell, Norwood.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, February 20, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Spirit divine, do Thou come to us that we may dwell together. There shall be a union of infinite might and human frailty. Thy holy word is with us: "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us." Oh, it is a mighty soul that can pity and forgive! He feels their appeal and tries to give them relief. We would pass by genius, wealth, and victory over enemies and ask Thee for the blessing of forgiving hearts and strong, decisive minds. This should be the underlying purpose of our beings. Magnify Thyself and enable us to carry serviceableness, cheer, and faithfulness into every duty of this day. Help the dark places of the world and bless them with heavenly light. In the name of Jesus, our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 18, 1928, they presented to the President of the United States for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9660. An act authorizing the city of Louisville, Ky., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near said city.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was presented to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President did on the following dates approve and sign bills of the House of the following titles:

On January 30, 1928:

H. R. 9022. An act to authorize the town of Alderson, W. Va., to maintain a public highway upon the premises occupied by the Federal Industrial Institution of Women at Alderson, W. Va.; and

H. R. 6053. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Linden-Lexington Road, in Perry and Decatur Counties, Tenn.

On February 3, 1928:

H. R. 5547. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Joseph in the State of Missouri, or its assigns, to

construct a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River between the States of Missouri and Kansas;

H. R. 280. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Red River at or near Coushatta, La.;

H. R. 5642. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across Red River at Fulton, Ark.;

H. R. 5582. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near the point where South Santa Fe Street in the city of El Paso crosses the Rio Grande, in the county of El Paso, State of Texas; and

H. R. 7218. An act to legalize a bridge across Hillsborough Bay at Twenty-second Street, Tampa, Fla.

On February 4, 1928:

H. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution for the amendment of the act of March 3, 1927, by authorizing an annual appropriation to carry out the cooperative experiments contemplated by the act; and

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution for the appointment of Paul E. Divine, of Tennessee, as member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

On February 6, 1928:

H. R. 5725. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Monroe, La.;

H. R. 5726. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Black River at or near Jonesville, La.; and

H. R. 5728. An act granting the consent of Congress to the police jury of Morehouse Parish, La., or the State Highway Commission of Louisiana, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew at or near Point Pleasant, La.

On February 7, 1928:

H. R. 9142. An act to amend section 71 of the Judicial Code, as amended, by changing time of holding court at El Dorado and Harrison, Ark.; and

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, the act of February 2, 1903, and the act of March 3, 1905, as amended, to include poultry within their provisions.

On February 8, 1928:

H. R. 5657. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of supervisors of Monroe County, Miss., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Tombigbee River at or near Aberdeen, Monroe County, Miss.

On February 10, 1928:

H. R. 10636. An act to make an additional appropriation for the water boundary, United States and Mexico.

On February 11, 1928:

H. R. 3400. An act to correct the military record of Andrew B. Ritter;

H. R. 5228. An act for the relief of Finas M. Williams;

H. R. 5994. An act for the relief of George C. Hussey;

H. R. 6162. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Ross;

H. R. 2138. An act for the relief of the owner of the schooner *Sentinel*;

H. R. 2145. An act for the relief of Albert J. Zyvoliski;

H. R. 4393. An act for the relief of Howard V. Sloan; and

H. R. 6466. An act granting a part of the Federal building site at Phoenix, Ariz., to the city of Phoenix for street purposes.

On February 13, 1928:

H. R. 172. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant and convey to the city of Vancouver a perpetual easement for public highway purposes over and upon a portion of the Vancouver Barracks Military Reservation in the State of Washington;

H. R. 164. An act to authorize appropriations for construction at the Pacific Branch Soldiers' Home, Los Angeles County, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 8092. An act for the relief of Randolph Sias;

H. R. 766. An act for the relief of Ida F. Baum;

H. R. 1405. An act granting six months' pay to Maria J. McShane;

H. R. 4127. An act for the relief of Joel T. Smith;

H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of Calvin H. Burkhead; and

H. R. 4777. An act to compensate Robert F. Yeaman for the loss of certain carpenter tools which was incurred by reason of a fire in the Government area at Old Hickory Ordnance Depot.

H. R. 4995. An act for the relief of Sabino Apodaca;

H. R. 5300. An act for the relief of Lewis H. Francke and Blanche F. Shelley, sole legal heirs of Ralph K. Warrington; and

H. R. 8889. An act for the relief of Adriano Cruceta, a citizen of the Dominican Republic.

On February 14, 1928:

H. R. 7013. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to lend to the Governor of Arkansas 5,000 canvas cots, 10,000 blankets, 10,000 bed sheets, 5,000 pillows, 5,000 pillowcases, and 5,000 mattresses or bed sacks, to be used at the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Little Rock, Ark., in May, 1928.

On February 15, 1928:

H. R. 6045. An act granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate the existing bridge across the Mahoning River at South Avenue, Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio;

H. R. 6099. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Lake Champlain between Crown Point, N. Y., and Chimney Point, Vt.;

H. R. 6483. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, the county of Lee, and the city of Dixon, or to any or either of them, jointly or severally, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rock River at Dixon, Ill.;

H. R. 6958. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Youngstown to construct a bridge across the Mahoning River at Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio;

H. R. 8269. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8369. An act for the relief of Josephine Thibodeaux.

On February 16, 1928:

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution granting consent of Congress to an agreement or compact entered into between the State of New York and the State of Vermont for the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission and to construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge across Lake Champlain;

H. R. 108. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of North Dakota and Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Red River of the North;

H. R. 193. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn.;

H. R. 194. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Morrison, State of Minnesota, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Little Falls, Minn.;

H. R. 199. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Monticello, Wright County, Minn.;

H. R. 319. An act to legalize a bridge across the Snake River at Idaho Falls, Idaho;

H. R. 444. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Wolf Point, Mont.;

H. R. 495. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Armstrong, a county of the State of Pennsylvania, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, at Kittanning, in the county of Armstrong, in the State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 5510. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Duluth, Minn., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Duluth Ship Canal;

H. R. 5583. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Co. of Texas and the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Rio Grande River, at or near Presidio, Tex.;

H. R. 5628. An act to extend the time for commencing and the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River;

H. R. 5638. An act granting the consent of Congress to rebuild and reconstruct and to maintain and operate the existing railroad bridge across the Tombigbee River, at Epes, in the State of Alabama;

H. R. 5744. An act granting the consent of Congress for the reconstruction of a bridge across the Grand Calumet River at East Chicago, Ind.;

H. R. 6041. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Allegheny River;

H. R. 6046. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Youngstown, Ohio, to construct a bridge across the Mahoning River at or near West Avenue, Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio;

H. R. 6479. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River between the borough of Wrightsville, in York County, Pa., and the borough of Columbia, in Lancaster County, Pa.;

H. R. 6512. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Little Calumet River at or near Wentworth Avenue, in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 6513. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Little Calumet River at or near Ashland Avenue, in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 6514. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Little Calumet River at or near Indiana Avenue, in Cook County, State of Illinois;

H. R. 6959. An act to legalize a bridge across the Caney Fork River in De Kalb County, Tenn.;

H. R. 7192. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between the municipalities of Rochester and Monaca, Beaver County, Pa.;

H. R. 7370. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Snake River near Indian Cove, Idaho;

H. R. 7374. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Snake River near Swan Valley, Idaho;

H. R. 7466. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, Valley County, Mont., and McCone County, Mont., or to any or either of them, jointly or severally, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Glasgow, Mont.;

H. R. 7745. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Chicago & North Western Railway Co., a corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Rock River;

H. R. 7902. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Department of the State of Alabama to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Coosa River at or near Wetumpka, Elmore County, Ala.;

H. R. 7913. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across Elk River on the Athens-Florence road between Lauderdale and Limestone Counties, Ala.;

H. R. 473. An act authorizing the Ashland Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Ashland, Ky.

On February 18, 1928:

H. R. 3926. An act for the relief of Joseph Jameson; and

H. R. 7009. An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes.

On February 20, 1928:

H. R. 6487. An act authorizing the Baton Rouge-Mississippi River Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.;

H. R. 7916. An act authorizing the Madison Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Madison, Jefferson County, Ind.;

H. R. 9186. An act authorizing the Sistersville Ohio River Bridge Co., a corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.

REPORT ON RESERVOIR CONTROL OF FLOOD WATERS

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a report on reservoir control of flood waters. I know the subject is of vital importance at this session. I want you all to read the report of Judge Driver, chairman of subcommittee on reservoirs for flood control. It is well worthy of being read by every citizen and by every Member of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include the following report

of Judge DRIVER, of Arkansas, made to the Flood Control Committee of the House while it was considering the subject of flood control.

The engineering profession, including civil and Army, are in accord on the theory that the ideal method of controlling floods is through the use of reservoirs by means of which waters are impounded and controlled in the source streams.

Recognition of the importance of reservoir control was given by the Chief of Engineers in the appointment of a special board of six members from the Corps of Engineers on the 11th day of June, 1927, and directions for an investigation into their feasibility. The Mississippi River Commission also directed one of its members, Col. C. W. Kutz, to cover the same subject, resulting in a comprehensive report by the reservoir board selected by the Chief of Engineers and headed by Col. William Kelly, and an abbreviated statement by the member selected by the Mississippi River Commission contained in the Mississippi River Commission report.

It appears from the report and hearings that within the period from June 11 to about November 1, 1927, some 500 reservoir sites were investigated from reports and studies, with practically all of the information used furnished by less than a dozen district engineers.

Both reports indorsed the theory of reservoir control, but rejected the same because of the economies involved, compared with the expense of other methods of control.

The question, therefore, occurs whether or not the investigations were sufficient to offer a basis of comparison and whether or not the hearings were sufficient to enable the committee to make a comparison of the costs of reservoir control with the plans of control advocated by the Chief of Engineers and by the Mississippi River Commission.

It is reasonable to assume that an ideal method of dealing with the problem would suggest the necessity for the exercise of the highest degree of care and thoroughness in an investigation touching the feasibility of its use and the element of expense involved. Therefore, the character of the investigation made is a proper subject of inquiry.

One of the first commissions created to deal with headwater improvement was the flood commission of Pittsburgh, composed of men of experience and assisted by engineers of eminence. Many months were spent by this commission in the study of their problem in the limited territory at the headwater areas and along the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers, which formed the Ohio River.

Another board dealing with a similar subject was the Interstate commission created to deal with the Arkansas, Red, and White River areas, which board devoted many months to the study of the headwater areas, tributary streams, and the main channels within their sphere of duty. Both commissions have filed elaborate reports covering their investigations, with recommendations governing particular sites, capacities, and elements of costs, and which are part of the records of the hearings before this committee. The duties charged to the commissions mentioned involved only investigations of limited areas, and received the undivided attention of the engineers performing the technical work required.

It appears that the investigation made by the member of the Mississippi River Commission was not a personal one, but made entirely from the reports of district engineers, while the reservoir board, in addition to the reports of such district engineers, availed itself of such information as could be procured from reports touching reservoir location and construction made to the various departments of the Government, but in no instance did any one site have the benefit of an observation by a single member of the board. At the same time, from the nature of the duties of the district engineers, it must be assumed that but little time was devoted to the study of the subject of their report. In fact, an examination of the reports of the Pittsburgh and interstate boards, containing an elaborate report of study of surveys and estimates of costs based on a personal investigation of each site, and with data secured by a thorough investigation and knowledge of the precipitation and stream flow, which required many months to collect, is the strongest evidence of the insufficiency of the investigations of the Mississippi River Commission and the reservoir board.

RELATIVE COSTS

The Chief of Engineers estimates the costs of necessary flood works under the plan advocated by him at \$184,000,000, excluding revetment and rights of way (which amounts to 2,000,000 acres of land in flood ways and the enlarged diversion channels through the Atchafalaya Basin), the value of which land, according to the estimate of the Mississippi River Commission, is \$91,000,000, to which must be added the Birds Point flood way area estimated by L. T. Berthe, consulting engineer for the district in which same is located, at \$18,500,000, aggregating \$294,500,000.

The Mississippi River Commission comprehensive plan is estimated to cost \$625,000,000 for flood-control works, with an interim plan designed to protect against a flood equal to that of 1927, at an estimated expense of \$332,500,000, both of which last-mentioned estimates include the value of required rights of way.

It is therefore difficult to find a basis for comparison in the real costs under the methods suggested in the Chief of Engineers and the

Mississippi River Commission plans, with the record evidence in the hearings of the cost of reservoir control.

The data and comments of Mr. E. E. Blake, of the interstate commission, on the general problem of reservoirs and estimate of cost, is worthy of serious consideration and is inserted here:

Characteristics of the Arkansas, Red, Missouri, Ohio, and upper Mississippi Basins for comparative approximation of cost of control

	Drainage area in square miles	Relative size	Average precipitation per annum
Arkansas-White.....	186,000	1	29
Missouri.....	528,850	3	23
Ohio.....	203,000	1.1	45
Upper Mississippi.....	187,850	1	31
Red.....	90,000	.5	40

Assuming the work of the interstate commission for the control of the Arkansas to be approximately correct, it could be completed at a cost of \$75,000,000, and addition of the White at an estimated cost of \$25,000,000, and the total Arkansas-White, \$100,000,000.

The Missouri, with three times the area, would be, roughly approximated, \$300,000,000, but this does not follow, as the rainfall is 25 per cent less, and, therefore the quantity of water to be controlled would mathematically be only 75 per cent of \$300,000,000, or \$225,000,000, figured on a geographical basis. However, the major part of the control of the Missouri would be above Kansas City, as the river is amply able to carry its run-off below Kansas City. The average precipitation above is only 18.9 inches, which as compared to the Arkansas would, on ratio of precipitation, bring the approximate cost of control relative to Arkansas as double, or \$200,000,000.

Considering the relative length of the Arkansas and the Missouri, and the relative length of their tributaries, and considering the longer period of discharge and the greater regularity of flow, the relative gradients, the relative precipitation by snow and water separately, and the seasonal differences, as reflected by the Mississippi River Commission's report of observations for the past 87 years, the ratio of cost of control again changes and the estimated cost of control's relation to the Arkansas would fix the Missouri at \$180,000,000.

Considering the easternmost area of each basin and the normal precipitation thereon and the necessity for control therein and the comparative approximate estimates of control therein, a marked difference of about 90 per cent is disclosed which, reflected in cost of control as to the eastern area, reduces the ratio of the Missouri which, calculated in dollars, represents about \$23,000,000. We are thus safe in estimating a control of the Missouri Basin at relatively 50 per cent more than the Arkansas and White Basin.

This is a great variance from the purely geographic area estimate heretofore, but is justified when the individual elements are considered. We therefore feel safe in asserting that the Missouri River could be adequately controlled and kept in the undestructive limit at its high stages and above an unusable limit at its low stages for approximately \$150,000,000.

Comparative study of the upper Mississippi Basin with relation to the interstate work out of the Arkansas.

Geographically considered they are almost parallel; they are almost the same in size. In annual precipitation they are almost the same. In character of precipitation they are vastly different, a large part being snow, from which the run-off is materially less than from an equal amount of rain.

Considering that portion of the upper Mississippi Basin of low precipitation and that part having the greatest precipitation, we find that both are materially below the Arkansas areas of similar characteristics.

Considering the character of flow and the character of the country for inexpensive control, the length of the stream and its gradient, and the periodicity of discharge, the dissimilarity of the characteristics in the two streams is still marked.

Without repeating the details recited as to the Missouri, we find that, to be perfectly safe, we figure an adequate control of the upper Mississippi at not exceeding \$40,000,000 to keep it below a destructive limit and above an interruption of commerce limit.

Considering the Ohio Subbasin with relation to the Arkansas Subbasin:

In geographic area the Ohio is 10 per cent greater, and on a strictly geographical basis the cost would be estimated \$110,000,000.

Considering the rainfall, we discover a relative increase of substantially 50 per cent, which would indicate a cost of control of \$150,000,000. However, considering the distribution of this rainfall through the year, we find much greater evenness of distribution which, carefully figured, reduces the ratio very materially.

Considering the areas of high precipitation on the Ohio Subbasin, to wit, Maryland, New York, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia, the areas are very small, the run-off undestructive locally and too small to be destructive in the longer streams and may be dropped from the equation as a discharge factor. However,

should control in those areas be deemed expedient, economical opportunities therefor are abundant.

This leaves only the areas of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, and Tennessee as material contributing elements, aggregating less than the Arkansas Basin, so that, considering the essential area of the Ohio Basin with relation to its annual precipitation, and with relation to the seasonal distribution of precipitation and the ratio of estimated cost of control is materially reduced.

Considering now the relative gradients of the streams as affecting the quickness of discharge, we find that this element obtains on the Arkansas from source to mouth, while on the Ohio Subbasin it ceases at the approach and in the main stream. We find also a stream of tremendously greater capacity for storage and discharge, and, on account of the difference in the gradient, which for this purpose we take Cincinnati as an average, we find that about 13,000 cubic feet of water per second adds 1 foot to the high flow at Cincinnati as compared to 100,000 second-feet required for 1 foot additional rise in the Arkansas at Little Rock at high flow. So that a storage of 1 acre-foot on the Ohio affects the elevation of the peak of the flood about eight times as much as an equal storage on the Arkansas at Little Rock, and about five times as much as an equal amount of storage affects the peak of the floods on the Missouri at Kansas City.

Thus, the aggregate, complete, and comprehensive control of the Mississippi Basin, considered by its individual integers, aggregates \$440,000,000.

We tender the suggestion, however, that, if the entire basin were treated as a unit and all the individual subbasins correlated by a comprehensive genius, a complete and adequate control could be brought within the limit of \$500,000,000, assuring complete protection to the properties of the valleys from the source to sea, and assuring a permanent, stabilized, connecting system of streams for public convenience and welfare, the promotion and regulation of interstate commerce.

The economic benefit to the Nation from such a development would be tremendously important.

Agreement, however, is reached on the maximum flood heights to be protected against.

The predicted "maximum possible" gauge at Cairo is 66 feet, equivalent to the passing of 2,250,000 second-feet; Arkansas City, 74 feet, or 2,850,000 second-feet; and at Angola or the mouth of Old River, 71.5 feet or 3,000,000 second-feet.

The places mentioned are used because they are—

First. The point where the waters of the Missouri, upper Mississippi, and Ohio converge;

Second. Where the waters passing down the main channel of the Mississippi River from Cairo south converge with the waters of the White and Arkansas Rivers; and

Third. Where the waters coming from the stated sources combine with the waters from the Red River and its tributaries.

It is conceded that a reduction of 6 feet on the gauge at Cairo, equivalent to 420,000 second-feet in volume of water, would create a state of perfect security for that city and the alluvial section from Cairo to the mouth of the Arkansas River, there being no streams of any consequence flowing into the main channel between said points. Therefore, we will look to the conditions in the Missouri, upper Mississippi, and Ohio watersheds.

First. The report of the reservoir board mentions 153 favorable sites, with a capacity of 64,100,000 acre-feet at an estimated cost of \$1,046,000,000, or an average cost of \$16.30 per acre-foot.

The Pittsburgh flood commission has selected 17 reservoir sites, estimated at a cost of \$21,672,000, through which the flood stage at Pittsburgh on the Ohio River can be reduced from 10 to 12 feet, and which would influence a reduction in the flow of the Ohio of 150,000 second-feet at that point. Without the data on which to base any calculation, it is but reasonable to assume that a like expenditure in the same character of country, would afford an equivalent reduction in the flow of the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers and principal tributaries of the Ohio River, which would amount to 300,000 additional second-feet of storage, or an aggregate of 450,000 second-feet reduction at a cost of approximately \$65,000,000.

It is asserted that the most pronounced reservoir effect on flood heights is given by those nearest the main stream, because of the diminution of the flow through absorption by the alluvial soil affecting the force of reservoirs on the headwater streams.

The extent of such influence is left in much doubt by the testimony in the record of the hearings, but the Army engineers have furnished a yardstick by which such effect should be estimated with reasonable accuracy and calculation. They state that the reduction in the flood flow of 1,850,000 second-feet from Cairo to the mouth of the Arkansas River, a distance of approximately 600 miles, would amount to 100,000 second-feet, or one-eighteenth of the entire volume. On the same basis of calculation, the reduction in the flood flow from Pittsburgh to Cairo, and an equivalent distance on the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers of 800 miles, would be 81,000 second-feet, or an influence at Cairo of 350,000 second-feet, which is equivalent to $5\frac{1}{2}$ foot reduction in the gauge at Cairo.

Mr. Clark E. Mickey, professor of civil engineering in the University of Nebraska, is an engineer of wide experience, thoroughly qualified and intimately acquainted with the streams and conditions in the Missouri watershed.

After an investigation into the drainage, precipitation, and run-off therein, he offers a concrete example of the reservoir possibilities of that region. He states that by means of a large dam located on the Missouri River near Fort Clark, N. Dak., the run-off from 40 per cent of the Missouri River drainage basin can be stored, amounting to 15,000,000 acre-feet, at an estimated cost of \$45,000,000. He further states that additional storage of 15,000,000 acre-feet may be obtained in the Great Plains region at an estimated cost of \$10 per acre-foot. On the basis of the estimate of reduction in flow, the impounding of 30,000,000 acre-feet in the Missouri River watershed at an expense of \$195,000,000 would be equivalent to the reduction in the discharge of 350,000 second-feet measured by the yardstick of the Army engineers. This would mean a reduced flood height at Cairo of slightly more than 250,000 second-feet, equivalent to a reduction in the gauge of $3\frac{1}{4}$ feet. But little information is furnished by other than the Army engineers on the upper Mississippi possibilities.

The district engineer at St. Paul mentioned six reservoir sites, with an aggregate capacity of 2,152,000 acre-feet, at a cost of \$1,322,000, or a per acre-foot cost of 61 cents. The estimate of effect on the gauge at Cairo was a reduction of 1,200 second-feet.

This is the cheapest storage mentioned by either Army or civilian engineers, and if reservoir sites are available in number sufficient at the same cost, the greatest possible effect may be found here at the least expense.

The flood at Cairo may not be from the combined Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. Therefore, dependence can not be placed on a reduction made in one of the streams, and it becomes necessary to sufficiently control each of the streams to obtain the necessary influence on the flood heights at Cairo. Under the estimates made the necessary security is obtained.

The "maximum possible" flood flow is based on the combined effect of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. Therefore, should the flood be from the combined flow, with a predicted maximum of 2,250,000 second-feet, we have a reduction on the Ohio of 350,000 second-feet, and 250,000 second-feet from the Mississippi, aggregating 600,000 second-feet, which diminishes the maximum flood flow to 1,650,000 second-feet. The existing levees at Cairo are sufficient to pass such flood in perfect security.

As the situation developed in the flood of 1922, the effect of the reservoir reduction on the Ohio, Tennessee, and Cumberland Rivers, would amount to $5\frac{1}{4}$ feet, or a reduction in the gauge to 48.1 feet. Reversing the flows as same occurred in the flood of 1927 where the flood height was in the Mississippi, with an ordinary high-water stage in the Ohio, and the reduction would be 250,000 second-feet, or equivalent to a reduction of $3\frac{1}{4}$ feet, or a gauge reduction from 58.5 feet to 55 feet.

The reductions calculated are based on the reservoir effect on the Ohio and Mississippi River stages at Cairo, and does not take into consideration any effect from such reservoir construction on the upper Mississippi, where no data is available on which to base calculation. The estimated expense of the necessary reservoir construction to obtain the diminished flow at Cairo would be \$340,000,000, and would relieve against the necessity of constructing the spillway from Birds Point to New Madrid, reducing the flood heights in the unleveed basins on the east side of the Mississippi between Tiptonville and Memphis, Tenn., at least one-half, reduce the back water area at the mouth of the St. Francis 75 per cent and would reach the mouth of the Arkansas River with 1,550,000 second-feet, which is the amount leaving Cairo, minus 100,000 second-feet lost by absorption.

This would relieve against any additional levee construction between said points, estimated by the Chief of Engineers at \$53,900,000, or \$101,000,000 under the comprehensive plan of the Mississippi River Commission.

The most thorough investigation made by an agency in the watersheds of the Mississippi River is that of the interstate commission created in Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Arkansas, Louisiana, Colorado, and Kansas, with the object of conserving the waters, controlling floods, and improving the Arkansas, Red, and White Rivers and their tributary streams. This commission was headed by an able and enthusiastic conservationist, who secured the services of the most expert engineers. After an exhaustive study this board reports the complete control of the three rivers mentioned at an expense of \$105,000,000.

The construction of two reservoirs on the Arkansas River, considered by the reservoir board and endorsed by the member of the Mississippi River Commission and which all of the engineers testifying in this case have admitted to be feasible, would lower the gauge in the flood flow of 1927 at Arkansas City about 7 feet. The reservoir board also reports that with 11 reservoirs constructed on the Arkansas and White Rivers a reduction of 8.4 feet would be had on the gauge at Arkansas City. An equivalent reduction in flood flow of 590,000 second-feet.

The interstate commission proposed under its estimate of expense to give effect to such control and by so doing, at a cost of \$109,000,000, would effect a reduction to the ordinary mean flow of such rivers. Such flow would not exceed 350,000 second-feet. Such addition to the

flood flow of 1,550,000 second-feet would produce 1,900,000 second-feet at the mouth of the Arkansas River and would carry to the Old River not exceeding that volume when Yazoo River contribution is added and absorption considered.

With the control of the Red River at an expense of \$5,000,000, the flow of that stream would be reduced to less than 100,000 second-feet, with a capacity in the Atchafalaya, without additional flood-control works, of 450,000 second-feet, which would care for the waters from Red River and its tributaries, and also draw 350,000 second-feet out of the Mississippi, or reduce the flow from Old River down the main channel to 1,550,000 second-feet, with 250,000 drawn through the Bonnet Carre spillway, which would leave 1,300,000 second-feet to pass by New Orleans. This volume of water can be passed there without increase in grade or section of existing levees, and render unnecessary the construction of Cypress Creek and Atchafalaya diversions, at an estimated expense of \$37,000,000 and levee enlargement cost of \$89,700,000, aggregating \$126,700,000, according to the Chief of Engineers and an estimate covering such diversions of \$159,500,000 and enlarged levees between the mouth of the Arkansas River to the Passes estimated to cost \$216,500,000, a total of \$376,000,000, by the Mississippi River Commission.

The plan of the Chief of Engineers omits cost of land in flood ways, estimated by the Mississippi River Commission at \$91,000,000, which must be added to his aggregate cost without regard to who may pay for it, which would increase his estimate to \$217,000,000.

Therefore we have the plan of the Chief of Engineers with estimate of \$318,400,000, and the comprehensive plan of the Mississippi River Commission at an estimated cost of \$577,200,000.

The total estimated cost of a comprehensive reservoir control is placed at \$445,000,000. E. E. Blake, the chairman of the interstate commission, asserts that contract with responsible parties can be entered into at any time for the amount of his estimate on reservoirs for the Red, Arkansas, and White River areas. If so, the estimates made on the other areas should be approximately accurate.

Certainly his estimates could not be more inaccurate than is offered by the Army engineers on the Cape Girardeau diversion, 300,000 second-feet, at the cost of \$337,000,000, compared with the estimate made by the Morgan Engineering Co., the outstanding engineering organization of the country, and with an experience in and intimate knowledge of streams, topography, etc., in the affected area, which furnishes an estimate at a cost of \$129,000,000 to afford the same amount of diversion, and through the same country.

The estimate referred to must of necessity depend upon a thorough study, with proper surveys, and by talent familiar with the subject, costs, etc., but the figures quoted are from the very best source of information available at this time, and when the other valuable uses to which the reservoirs may serve is considered, the promise is offered of an ideal method of control within the limit of the lowest estimated cost of levees and diversion, and much less than the maximum of cost of the more comprehensive plan embracing the same elements of control works. The latter carries no return beyond the protection afforded, with continued burden of maintenance.

Reservoir control will yield a return, increasing from year to year as the local developments within the sphere of their influence expand, saving to fruitful service the millions of acres of land proposed under levee and diversion control for flood ways and backwater areas and forever remove the dread fear of the valley from recurring floods. It will contribute the needed volume of water to the stream flows in periods of limited precipitation to guarantee navigation to our waterways and furnish to the areas where high freight rates prevail adequate transportation facilities at the cheapest possible cost.

INVITATION TO LUNCH

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to invite you and the membership of the House and members of the press at 1 o'clock to eat oysters in the basement of the Capitol. They are the famous Smyrna Bay oysters of North Carolina. These oysters were furnished through the courtesy of Mr. J. E. Woodland, of Morehead City, N. C., now in the gallery. [Applause.]

HOOR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow, Tuesday, it adjourn to meet on Wednesday at 11 o'clock a. m., with the understanding that if this is done the Farewell Address of George Washington will be read and the House will immediately thereafter adjourn in order to attend the celebration at Alexandria. I understand that similar action will probably be taken in the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS OF HON. FINIS J. GARRETT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record including in them a very interesting and instructive address made at the Democratic editorial meeting at Indianapolis, Ind., February 16, by our

minority leader, the Hon. FINIS J. GARRETT. It is a very able address, and I am sure will be read with much pleasure by everyone.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing an address by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address, delivered by Hon. FINIS J. GARRETT, of Tennessee, at the meeting of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association at Indianapolis on the night of February 16:

PARTY GOVERNMENT

Gentlemen of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association, I am deeply appreciative of the honor done me by the invitation to address your organization, and I thank you for it.

It is always a pleasure to come to Indiana, and no occasion could be more highly appreciated by me than this.

I may say that no experience of my life has been more interesting to me than a few years during my young manhood when I was engaged in editing and publishing a small weekly newspaper. It was not a very pretentious organ but the experience was invaluable and I think it has always enabled me to get something of the editor's viewpoint and feeling.

I wish at the outset to express to you the genuine appreciation which is had by their associates in Washington of the three Democratic Representatives in Congress from Indiana, Messrs. CANFIELD, GARDNER, and GREENWOOD, the latter of whom is the chairman of our House caucus. These gentlemen are among the hard workers of the House, attentive to every duty, and loyal to every interest of our party and country. By reason of ability and industry they have taken high rank worthy the fine traditions of the State, and it gives me pleasure to say this here among the people of their homes.

In casting about for a theme none occurred to me which appeared more suited to the occasion than that of party government.

I trust I shall be able to discuss this in a somewhat educational way and without undue partisanship.

Why do political parties exist? What is their significance? Why do they bear the names they do? What is their history? And, above all, what are their purposes and missions?

At the outset it may be stated as a well-known fact that popular government—the rule of the people by themselves—practically always works out its major problems through the instrumentality of party. In some instances it is rather the custom for parties to form about issues as they arise. In many countries there are group systems, bloc organizations so numerous as that party responsibility is an unknown thing and legislative results are obtained only by temporary and usually ephemeral coalitions. This results in a situation where men who to-day are standing shoulder to shoulder, seeing eye to eye upon a question, may to-morrow be bitter antagonists. It is scarcely necessary to say that such governments are unable to have that fixity of purpose and stability of program essential to the highest degree of peace, public happiness, and national security.

I have read that the little Nation of Latvia, not as large territorially as the State of Indiana, has 26 political parties or groups. There are racial groups, religious blocs, economic blocs, all sorts and kinds of political divisions. This is an extreme case, to be sure, but even in France there are so many different political organizations in her parliament as that no ministry is secure overnight. In Germany there is no party with a clear majority in her Reichstag and only the powerful personality of President Von Hindenburg, coupled with a popular realization of Germany's dire necessity for harmony, makes any ministry there temporarily secure. Even in England, with all her background of ministerial tradition and conservatism, we witnessed within very recent years a coalition government with no party in power to be responsible at the bar of public opinion.

Here in our own land—and, I believe, most fortunately—we have the two-party system. To be sure the problems of government are diverse and arise in different forms. Sometimes they are constitutional, involving the interpretation and application of organic law; sometimes they are economic and fiscal; sometimes they are social and moral, and quite naturally history teems with occasions when upon many questions parties have overlapped, and almost every national campaign witnesses outbursts of dissatisfaction with the two large organizations manifesting itself in third and fourth party movements. Some of these latter two have at times reached considerable temporary proportions, but eventually all have proven sporadic and our political system continues grounded to-day, as it has been almost from the beginning, upon the two-party basis.

It must not be overlooked that neither of these two organizations has been at all times upon all questions consistent. In a recent very interesting work on "Origins of the Whig Party," Mr. Carroll, its author, says in the opening chapter:

"The names of American political parties give a superficial impression of unity that rarely exists in fact. Individual differences of opinion, sectional interests, and conflicting personal ambitions combine to make complete harmony an ideal that can only be approximated by a free use of compromises and adjustments."

We have numerous instances in Congress of Members elected as members of the one party or the other who really feel very little party responsibility. This makes life there a bit more interesting, perhaps, for those who do feel that responsibility and are trying to serve it, but if ever a majority of its members become of that mind there will be at least temporary chaos.

In California and Pennsylvania, both by custom and law, persons may seek nomination by all parties in the primaries, and many of them do and obtain them. I recall one very strong man from California who was a bitter opponent of prohibition who came to Congress, elected as the nominee of all the parties, including the primary nomination of the prohibition party itself.

It is a bit difficult for us in Tennessee to understand such a practice, and I may say in passing that such a system is almost destructive of the minority party in a State, so far as representation in Congress is concerned.

But notwithstanding the fact that there have been variations from decade to decade in the application of party principles, notwithstanding the defections and deflections occasioned by conceptions of expediency, the lure of personal ambitions to hold place and power and the yielding to gusts of apparent popular psychology, the principles themselves have been perpetual and throughout all our national existence, under the Constitution, save the major portion of Washington's two administrations, we may trace with reasonable clearness the line of party cleavage.

Another fact to be borne in mind is that it was the coming into being of the National or Federal Government which caused the formation of the parties as we have them. They did not grow primarily out of State or local problems; and I think the reason these parties have been, generally speaking, permanent in character, although changing in name, is because we have written constitutions wherein the founders sought to and did set outposts for even governmental authority and fix limitations upon the power of government itself.

One of the struggles all down the 140 years of national growth and social evolution has been to preserve the "Thou shalt nots" imbedded in the Constitution by the wise men who came out of the wilderness and laid the beams of the chambers of a Nation in which democracy—government by the governed—found its finest written plan; negations, if you please, intended to protect the individual, the single being, the sole person, in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, from even the selfishness or the caprice or the injustice of a temporarily devastating majority, to say nothing of a temporarily triumphant minority. The judicial department of the Federal Government was erected fundamentally for that specific purpose.

General Washington was not until after his retirement from the Presidency in any sense a party man. There were no definitely organized entities as political agencies whose forces were applied to or for him or which he sought to apply at either of his elections, and both of them were unanimous in the Electoral College. Whatever his dispositions may have been, they were curbed and nothing of a party nature attaches to his official life.

That this inured to the Nation's fortune we can see quite clearly, and, recognizing his virtue and wisdom, it causes no wonderment.

The new and novel experiment in government would inevitably have failed had he pursued a different course and placed himself at the head—for unavoidably this man of whom Beck says "He was always Caesar" would have been the head—of a party organization.

That was the legislative formative period of the United States. The Constitution had been adopted, and by the third year of his first administration all the 13 original States had accepted the terms and become affiliated with the Union, while by the close of his second the three new States of Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee had been admitted upon equal terms with the older Commonwealths, but few indeed were the provisions of that Constitution that were self-executing. It was a dormant organism, which could be brought to function only by legislative and administrative action.

No President applying partisanship could have successfully met the challenge of that era or guided the new Republic out from its vicissitudes into the security in which Washington left it.

But while Washington held aloof from party movement and Vice President Adams in considerable degree emulated his example, there was no such restraint upon the two outstanding figures of his first Cabinet, and out of it there flashed—or, perhaps, it would be better to say there flamed—with steady glow the brilliancy and genius of Thomas Jefferson, the Secretary of State, and Alexander Hamilton, the Secretary of the Treasury.

The responsibilities of these men did not demand the restrictions which duty imposed upon Washington. Jefferson had, of necessity, as one dealing with foreign nations, to exercise a greater degree of self-control and caution than Hamilton, whose official duties were primarily domestic, but in the main neither of them suffered in their political

activities very much restraint, aside from that imposed by the dictates of politeness, and at times even this was rather thinly veiled.

It was an evidence of Washington's impartial political attitude that both were invited into his official family, and both remained until, with regret in each case, he accepted their resignations because he knew them well, and he was a master at judging men. They were little alike except in genius, vision, industry, and impeccable integrity. Temperamentally they were wholly at variance—Hamilton impetuous, incisive, impatient of restraint, domineering in intellect and will; Jefferson cautious, slow to reach conclusions, apparently reluctant to make decisions, but with a subtle intellect capable of sounding the depths as well as reaching the heights of human nature and of life.

They had some interests in common, but Jefferson's were the broader in scope; Hamilton had some taste for art, sculpture, paintings, but his life's passions were politics and law. At the shrine of these he worshipped with unstinted and almost undivided devotion. He had, too, a love for and might, had opportunity offered, have displayed a genuine genius for things military—the maneuver of armed troops, the strategy and tactics of war. For this latter Jefferson had no stomach or predilection. His was a philosophy of peace—some of his critics say of timorousness.

But aside from military art, Mr. Jefferson's trained and seasoned intellect traversed the whole realm of men's activities and accomplishments and ambitions. He loved music and was a skilled violinist; agriculture interested him, and he was a constant student of plant life, of flora, and of fauna; science engaged his love, and every mechanical invention coming within his reach appealed to his attention; he cultivated refined arts, and the tobacco leaf and the corn blade designed by him for the capitals of the columns at Monticello and copied upon certain of those in the National Capitol Building at Washington are an evidence of his artistic taste and love of the beautiful.

Public education and religious freedom were controlling principles with him, and when he dictated what his epitaph should be he passed over all references to having occupied exalted official positions and directed that there be carved upon his tomb:

"Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia."

It is one of the singular events of history that Hamilton, born of obscure parentage in a little island of the West Indies, became the leader of a class and aristocratic movement, while Jefferson, born to the purple of luxury, became the greatest democratic philosopher of the ages and the undisputed leader of the great American democratic movement.

Such, however, was true, and to these two geniuses of their day may be traced, not exactly the origin perhaps, but at least the organization into cohesive entities of those schools of thought which, under different party names, for a century and a quarter have struggled for domination in the affairs of these United States.

The late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge was a devoted and intellectual disciple of Alexander Hamilton, and no one will probably be found to dispute either his right or his power to state tersely and succinctly the fundamentals of the Hamiltonian faith.

In his Alexander Hamilton, written as one of the American statesmen's series, the late Senator, after quoting from one of Hamilton's reports to Congress and declaring "the cardinal doctrines of Hamilton in questions of politics and government were strength and order," and after elaborating upon this to some extent, says:

"Hamilton's scheme went further, seeking to create a strong, and, so far as was possible and judicious, a permanent class all over the country, without regard to existing political affiliations, but bound to the Government as a government, by the strongest of all ties, immediate and personal pecuniary interest. The wisdom of this was obvious, when the object was to sustain a great experiment; yet at the same time Hamilton's purpose was not simply by the spread of a popular loan to unite a body of men in the support of the Government, but chiefly and mainly to bring to his side a class already in existence, that which controlled the capital of the country. The full intent of the policy was to array property on the side of the Government. That once done, the experiment, Hamilton felt, would succeed, and its powers moreover might then be much extended. He had been unable to introduce a class influence into the Constitution by limiting the suffrage for the President and Senate with a property qualification, but by his financial policy he could bind the existing class of wealthy men, comprising at that day the aristocracy bequeathed by provincial times to the new system, and thus, if at all, assure to the property of the country a powerful influence upon the Government."

The creed of Mr. Jefferson as stated by himself has never been improved upon for style, compactness, or lucidity, nor can it be. In his first inaugural address he condensed it within the briefest possible limit, saying:

"About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear,

stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of State governments in all their rights as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwark against antirepublican tendencies; the preservation of the general Government in its whole constitutional vigor as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people, a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principles of republics from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority, economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civil instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety."

In these two statements we have the elemental germs of all the political principles over which men in these United States have since divided. Their vitality has never diminished, and all the issues of to-day are comprehended within their terms.

The history of the parties that have embraced these principles is most interesting and their names significant. The Hamilton organization in its very beginning was designated as the Federalist Party. It was proper nomenclature; it expressed the central thought of its leader's policy—a strongly centralized National Government, with a gradual but steady diminution of the power and prestige of the several States until local government should be reduced to a minimum and all governmental activities, whether social or economic, concentrated in the Federal organism. The complete realization of Mr. Hamilton's dearest dreams would have eventually destroyed every vestige of State sovereignty. "Federalist" was, therefore, the logical and proper name for the organization sponsoring such principles.

Jefferson gave to the organization which, with the aid of Madison, Gallatin, McClay, and others, he had by 1800 succeeded in welding into a unified and overwhelming mass the name "Republican." This, too, was in accord with the prophecies. The word married the system to the methods and machinery through which it was proposed to operate; that is, in the main through agents chosen from time to time by the electorate to legislate and execute. Its basis was representative government, with frequent opportunities for popular expression.

The Federalists, however, were unwilling to permit the opposition party to name itself, and quite early they began to designate its members as "Democrats," alleging that Mr. Jefferson and his followers drew their principles and inspiration from the promoters of the French Revolution.

Mr. Lodge, whether he intends it as a contemptuous criticism or a fair historical statement, refutes this as to Jefferson, however, when he declares that the latter did not get his ideas from France, but that he carried them with him to France. At any rate, the name "Democrat," which was at first applied in derision but which later was to be adopted and worn with pride for a century, did not gain immediate recognition and the party was for a quarter of a century officially known as "Republican."

The first victories went to Hamilton. In the formulation of domestic economic policies before parties began he had generally the sympathy and support of President Washington. The Congress during the earlier days was sitting in New York. It was then the third city in point of commercial importance, Philadelphia and Boston being, respectively, first and second. During the second Washington administration it sat at Philadelphia. Thus the Congress throughout the formative period was surrounded closely by the influences whose natural interests made them partisans of the Hamilton policy. Those were days when communication between the people and the Nation's Capital was difficult and slow of passage. Hamilton carried his proposals for debt assumption by the Federal Government at the full face value, notwithstanding the major part of the paper was in the hands of speculators who had bought it for practically nothing; his tariff policy for the stimulation of manufactures and his measure for the establishment of a national bank.

All these provoked a struggle, but they were carried, and by the time the program had been completed Hamilton had a party already organized and trained beneath his iron hand to follow with little question the suggestion of his genius—a party to his liking, "bound to the Govern-

ment by the strongest of all ties—immediate and personal pecuniary interest." He never relied upon nor, except in cases of absolute necessity, appealed for popular support. Of this he was contemptuous. More than any leading man of his time he distrusted the intelligence and ability of the populace. Jefferson, on the other hand, more strongly than any leader reposed confidence in the ability of the masses to govern themselves and render popular government secure; and so, while Hamilton was going forward to victory after victory, he, more through the pens of his great lieutenants than through his own (for he wrote but little for the public until after his retirement from Washington's Cabinet), was putting into operation the forces of popular organization and democratic expression.

Hamilton never admired John Adams nor thought him properly equipped for the Presidency. In both of the latter's presidential campaigns the former preferred Pinckney and desired his selection; but even he, master of his party though he was, lacked sufficient political finesse (he was one statesman who was not a politician) to control the forces that were playing about him, and in the first, Adams triumphed, while in the second he went down to defeat before the popular onslaught which Jefferson organized and launched, and so insecure was the foundation upon which Hamilton had builded that his structure fell with the defeat of Adams and never again achieved a national success.

Jefferson and his party triumphed and the Federalist Party passed off the scene.

There followed him Madison and Monroe, faithful to his policies, and supported by Congresses in which the majorities were composed of his followers.

So entrenched had the principles of Democracy become as that by the expiration of Mr. Monroe's first term there had arisen what is known in history as the "era of good feeling," and he was reelected by unanimous vote in the electoral college, lacking one, which was withheld from him, not out of antagonism, but because the elector felt that to General Washington only should go the distinction of a unanimous election to the Presidency.

This brings us to 1824 and the contest which finally culminated in the election by the House of Representatives in 1825 of John Quincy Adams, son of the second President, and himself eminent as a scholar, diplomat, and statesman.

The party status of Mr. Adams is somewhat anomalous. He was most of the time in foreign lands, serving in diplomatic positions, while the parties were being formulated. In 1803 he was elected to the United States Senate by the Legislature of Massachusetts, the majority of whose members were Federalists, but he was not elected by a party vote and in the Senate gave support to many of President Jefferson's policies.

The support of one of these—the embargo act—led in 1808 to resolutions of criticism by the legislature, which caused him to resign. He was again returned to the Foreign Service by President Madison, and by President Monroe was made Secretary of State.

The Republican Party, which by this time was beginning to be called the Democratic-Republican, was in reality the only national organization in existence, and all the candidates of 1824, including Mr. Adams, were regarded as being of it; but here and there certain congressional districts still elected Representatives who called themselves Federalists. All the remaining Federalist strength came to Mr. Adams's support, and this, plus what he drew from the Republicans, gave him the vote of 13 States in the House of Representatives, and thus elected him, although he had received but 84 out of a total of 261 votes in the Electoral College.

ANDREW JACKSON ENTERS

It was in the good year of 1824 that a lank and angular horseman rode out of the 28-year-old Commonwealth of Tennessee, to which theretofore his political activity had been almost wholly confined, and stationed himself upon the field of national politics, which he was soon to dominate as never before or since has that field been dominated by mortal man.

His name was Andrew Jackson.

He was by no means an unknown, nor was his fame confined to any State or section or even to the wide Nation, which in 1824 had become a Union of five and twenty sovereign States.

His name was known, particularly in military circle, in all the civilized lands beyond the seas.

Madison and Monroe were placed before the people as presidential candidates by joint caucuses of the Republican (Democratic) Members of Congress held in the Hall of the House of Representatives at Washington. That was before the day of national political conventions. Gradually there grew up a popular resentment against such action. It was voiced by Henry Clay when Monroe was first nominated in 1816 in a resolution declaring it inexpedient for the caucus to make any recommendation upon the subject "to the good people of the United States." His resolution failed, however, and Monroe was recommended then, as he again was in 1820.

By 1824, however, public sentiment had so crystallized in opposition to that system as that when the caucus for that purpose was held in February of that year only about 70 out of the 216 Republican

(Democratic) members attended it. William H. Crawford, of Georgia, received the indorsement, but it had ceased to be of value, and he received but 41 of the 261 electoral votes.

Jackson, from the time that he began to take any interest in the question at all, was vigorously opposed to the caucus plan, and he showed no regard or respect for its action in 1824.

In July, 1822, the Legislature of Tennessee had nominated him for President for the elections of 1824, and in 1823 he was again elected to the Senate of the United States.

Most historians seem to agree that General Jackson evinced no great interest in his candidacy of 1824; certainly there were none of those terrific efforts which attended his subsequent campaign, but he received the plurality of the popular vote and also of the Electoral College, having 99 of the 261 votes cast in the latter. His popularity had been demonstrated. He had surpassed that trio of seasoned statesmen—Adams, Crawford, and Clay—in popular appeal. It was not unnatural that a master politician such as he, though differing in type from all that had preceded him or who were his contemporaries, should have been stirred by the evident opportunity which laid before him to become the Nation's Chief Magistrate, but this might have passed, particularly in view of his enfeebled health, had it not been for an occurrence shortly after the general elections which shook the country to its uttermost bounds and made him inevitably a candidate for 1828.

No person having received a majority of the entire electoral vote, under the Constitution the decision passed to the House of Representatives, which had to choose from among the three highest, each State having one vote. Adams was elected, and a few days thereafter was inaugurated, and appointed Henry Clay as Secretary of State. The charge was immediately made that this was the result of a bargain; that Clay had thrown his influence to Adams as the result of an agreement whereby the former was to become his premier, with a view, of course, to being his successor as President, as had been the case of the former Secretaries of State.

There is no time to review that controversy thus precipitated a hundred years ago. It was one of the most momentous single incidents of American political history; it lay at the basis of a new line of political and party cleavage; it led to the duel between Clay and Randolph, of Roanoke. Clay denied the allegation and offered by his challenge to Randolph to defend this denial with his life. It changed history, and it was by no means the last quarrel of Jackson which was to have such an effect.

Jackson accepted the allegation as true and went to his grave in the unalterable belief of its truth. Most historians have acquitted Clay of the charge, but Jackson never did. Suspicion with him petrified into immediate obsession and his conviction was never shaken.

The first effect was to make him at once a candidate for 1828. He had carried the popular plurality; he was the people's choice; and they had been denied their choice, so he and his friends maintained, "by a corrupt and shameful bargain."

The Legislature of Tennessee—doubtless this time with his earnest approval and desire—in 1825 nominated him again for the election of 1828, then nearly four years in the future. He resigned from the Senate at once and entered with all the vigor of his vehement nature upon the four-year struggle.

That contest threw its shadow over the whole of John Quincy Adams's administration, it affected the attitude of Members of Congress upon every legislative movement of the time, for when Jackson fought he used every legitimate weapon upon which he could lay his hands and enlisted every man whom he could bend to his iron will. His whole appeal was to the people; he sought, as perhaps not even Jefferson ever sought, to ramify the popular thought with his cause and saturate it with a desire for vengeance and vindication. It was a titanic struggle, the forerunner of many to come. There belonged to him, as Thackeray says of Swift:

"As fierce a beak and talon as ever struck—as strong a wing as ever beat."

And the people responded; heaven bless us, how they did respond! Do not for one moment become obsessed with the idea that this was a mere uprising, as of a mob. Under the banner of this mighty militant there had enlisted as fine intelligence and as excellent probity as ever lent themselves to a cause—men who were themselves leaders of men, all thrilling with the impulse of their chieftain, all inspired by the flash of those penetrating eyes, whose sparks flew out for the pale, lean, classic face which was as if chiseled from granite.

He became the embodiment of democracy; its "cloud by day and its pillar of fire by night." His lieutenants in every section of the Republic organized popular sentiment and gave it intelligent direction. They marched with pride behind a leader who knew how to lead and had the purpose and the will. The name "Republican" was dropped by his followers and proudly they called themselves "Democrats," as their predecessors in the days of Jefferson had been designated in derision and in scorn.

His triumph was complete, overwhelming; and a few days before his sixty-second birthday he was sworn in as President of the United

States by the venerable Chief Justice John Marshall, the last great link connecting the long-dead Federalist organization with the eager and victorious Democracy.

I must not, out of deference to your patience, attempt now any detailed résumé of his administrations and their achievements. Almost all that was accomplished was the product of ceaseless struggle and embittered contest.

The history of the break with Calhoun and its effects is important enough briefly to sketch it. It was politics—great politics—in the raw. It was a mighty drama in which we see the play of human passion, sometimes at its best, sometimes at lower levels.

Toward the latter part of his first administration Jackson was placed in possession of a letter stating that while he was engaged in the Seminole military campaign, Mr. Calhoun, then Secretary of War in the Cabinet of Monroe, had, in a Cabinet meeting, urged censure upon Jackson for his conduct, alleging that he had exceeded his authority. Jackson had had some intimation years before that such a proposition had been made, but he believed it came from Crawford, Monroe's Secretary of the Treasury. He was strengthened in this belief by criticisms which Crawford, joining Clay, had made in the open Senate. The information that it was Calhoun, who, up to then, notwithstanding Jackson's love for Van Buren, had been his political favorite, came as a terrible blow. It aroused all the fire and fury of his well-nigh unrestrainable nature. He sent the letter to Calhoun, without any publicity being given it, and asked a direct response.

Calhoun admitted it and attempted to explain, but no explanation could satisfy the enraged man, who felt that his honor was deeply touched. After many months the correspondence was made public, and all relations between them ceased. Jackson had added to Clay and other enemies another of the most brilliant and incisive intellects of that or any other age.

It destroyed all hope of Calhoun succeeding him in the Presidency; it brought about the rejection of Van Buren by the Senate—the Vice President casting the deciding vote against him—as minister to England, to which he had been given a recess appointment, and he had to return in semidisgrace, only to be nominated, under Jackson's compulsion, in 1832 for Vice President and elected to preside over the body which had so recently humiliated him. It doubtless had something to do with Calhoun's resignation from the Vice Presidency in December, 1832, to enter the Senate from South Carolina, where he took upon himself the defense of nullification by a State of Federal law, a challenge which Jackson first answered with the famous toast at the noted banquet, "The Federal Union—it must be preserved," and later by lengthy proclamation and the actual assembling of armed forces of the Government.

Clay in the meantime had reentered the Senate. Webster had been there during all of Jackson's administration and before, and then occurred one of those strange incidents of history. The three of them, moved in part by impulses of personal feeling and in part by points of difference with the President, although themselves disagreed upon many matters and at times maintaining no personal relations, formed a coalition against Jackson and stood forth as the great triumvirate. There is no evidence that Webster hated Jackson. He supported him most vigorously in his fight upon nullification, but he loved the bank and was prepared to go the limit in traffic and sacrifice to assure the continuance of its life. The two others not only disagreed with Jackson upon many public questions but they hated him personally. If they did not hate him as much as he despised them, it was simply because of a lack of capacity for hating. The will was there.

No stronger intellectual combination was ever formed against a man or a cause in the world, but he triumphed.

It was with complete content and entire satisfaction that he turned from the White House on March 4, 1837, after witnessing the installation of his successor, whom he himself had named, and, leaving his enemies crushed behind him, made his triumphant journey to the Hermitage, and sat himself down by his window, which looked out over the garden where Rachel slept under the springtime flowers.

If one may be called upon to sum up Jackson in a few words and interpret him to mankind, I think it may be done by saying that he was democracy incarnate, plus the purpose, the will, and the power to enforce its decrees. He could not have been a Jefferson any more than Jefferson could have been a Jackson, but he would have been Jackson had Jefferson never lived. Democracy was not to him an abstract art or an abstruse science. It was a virile system to be applied to the needs, the evolution, and the developments of society. He grasped by intuition what so many have not learned at all, or only learned by painful processes of study and labor; and what he believed he put into action; his faith was made to function in living law.

Great as the party system which he had bullded, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say rebuilt, and compactly as he had welded it together, with his personality removed it began to weaken. He was followed in the Presidency and leadership of his party during the pre-Civil War period by men who are entitled to the designation of great, but somehow no one of them could quite "bend the bow of Ulysses."

Within four years after his retirement he witnessed, with what mingled disgust and humiliation we can well imagine, the defeat of the great party which he had left so strong.

It is rather difficult to account for the triumph of Harrison in 1840. He was the first of two Whig Presidents, Zachary Taylor being the other, both of whom died in office, to be elected. Both had achieved military distinction and this may have tipped the scales in their favor.

The Whig Party sprang up during Jackson's day and took its name from the English organization which had been formed in opposition to the crown. It was a misnomer so far as America was concerned, and it would seem as if Clay and Webster, with all their talents, might have thought of a better. They were unwilling, it seems, to revive the name "Republican," so closely associated with Jefferson, as was done in 1854, when slavery was becoming the one great issue, and so they took the name of Whig because, as they said, they opposed the tyranny of Jackson as the English party opposed the tyranny of the King.

The unconscious irony was clearly to be seen when it is remembered that Jackson relied always and absolutely upon popular support, not only for election, but for the indorsements and sustaining of his policies.

This was no demagoguery with him; it was sacred to him as an article of faith.

The Whig Party embraced the principles of Hamilton and thus became the lineal descendant of the Federalist organization, but notwithstanding their successes of 1840 and 1848 they were never able to apply their principles. Tyler, who succeeded Harrison upon his death, disappointed them upon the bank question, and no serious effort was ever thereafter made to revive this institution in the Hamiltonian form. As a matter of fact, but little of Jackson's work was undone until after the war of secession.

In 1844 his party retrieved its prestige in part, and his friend and protégé, James K. Polk, was elected President.

The old warrior saw no other presidential contest, for on the 8th of June, 1845, his spirit joined the spirit of Rachel, and his body was laid beside her in the garden where the flowers were abloom.

Following the defeat of 1852 and with the passing of Webster and Clay the Whig Party almost immediately died. The Federalist Party had just one term of the Presidency and died after one defeat; its first successor had two terms and died after two defeats.

Following its death there was organized as the opposition party the one which exists to-day under the name of Republican. This was taken for a number of reasons. Many then survived who had followed the old party of Jefferson to victory under that name, and, above all, Jefferson had been the sworn and earnest foe of slavery, and this was the sole question about which the founders proposed to build the new movement.

The national platforms of that party in 1856 and 1860 contain reference to little save this. Lincoln was not one of the founders of the Republican Party. He joined it after it had been thoroughly organized and was a "going concern" in 1856, and became its infinitely greatest leader, but that leadership was along the lines and within the limitations of the platform which dealt only with slavery.

We know but little of Lincoln's economic ideas. There are fugitive utterances to be found here and there, to be sure, but these are not sufficiently comprehensive to enable us to reconstruct any general system to which he adhered. His public life was comparatively brief, so far as holding office was concerned. He was in national position for little more than six years, one term as a Representative in Congress and four years and a month as President. He was a member of the Whig Party, to be sure, and an admirer of Henry Clay; but, so far as his own utterances were concerned, we have little from which to deduce the bent of his mind upon economics.

That party was founded upon an idealism of which Lincoln was the incarnation. It was inevitable that the results of the war of secession should give to it a long lease of power. The Democratic Party became associated in public thought almost exclusively with the doctrine of State rights, and the expression "State rights" for a generation, almost, brought to millions of persons, as the initial thought, secession, war, a land billowed with graves, and a country filled with homes wherein sat mothers who were "weeping for their children and would not be comforted." The popular psychology produced by such a situation was inevitable. In the platform of 1864 the same "Republican" was not used by the convention which nominated Lincoln and Johnson, but the body was composed principally of that party's members, and the organization, the party machinery, was in their hands. It was in existence, and there needed only to be fused into it the elements for which the war success opened the way to render it for a long time practically invincible. Wise and far-seeing interests grasped this fact and, seizing upon the party of Abraham Lincoln, they engrafted upon it, in so far as they could, the old policies of Federalism, which have been with us from the beginning, and made it the party of Alexander Hamilton.

Such is an outline of party history—rather imperfect, perhaps, but believed to be essentially correct and fairly stated. In the conditions of to-day are to be found, in principle, all the issues that marked the early years of the Republic.

Honest convictions continue to flourish devoted to each school of thought, and upon careful analysis I believe that every major question can be resolved into one or the other classes. In other words, I believe there are just two great schools of political thought between

which most of our people are normally divided, and I further adhere to the belief that two parties are all that we need. After all, the party is not the end; it is the instrumentality for working the end. We are sure to have party government of some type. I prefer the system with which we are familiar rather than one of groups and blocs. Party government means party responsibility; government by a coalition of divergent groups formed about some especial conviction or temporary prejudice, each with its own pet hobby, means there is no one organization responsible to public opinion; no majority to be used as an agency for working the public will. What we need most is to get away from so much political expediency and plant ourselves upon the principles which underlie our respective party faiths.

In conclusion, I shall venture to speak just a bit more particularly of our own party and with special reference to present conditions.

Democracy is not a state of mind nor a psychological manifestation. It is a fundamental thing which lies deep in the human heart, and in its essence is of the profoundest philosophy of human life.

It does not spring from government; it underlies government, at least our Government.

Simply because man exists he is possessed of certain rights. They are coexistent with his birth and coextensive with his being. Government is merely to assure these rights, and the highest functioning of government is that activity, or lack of activity, as necessity dictates, which preserves them.

Democracy is the antithesis of selfishness, and its constant danger is that it become the victim of greed. Because of its very nature it is surrounded always with enemies, enemies that are astute, alert, constantly organized, and ever watchful.

Because its character renders it unable to offer favors of law and enable one individual through legislative manipulation to profit at the expense of another, it does not, as an instrument of government, command the influence or elicit the support of special interests. It has to rely upon reason, upon justice, and make its appeal to the higher motives and the broader sympathies of mankind, and, unfortunately, these are not always in the ascendancy.

These enemies, watchful and adroit, are masters of political warfare. Tactics, strategics, logistics—they possess them all, and never yet have they been found lacking in munitions.

They understand frontal attack and flank movement; when to strike and when to give the counterstroke. The value of espionage they recognized long ago, and above all things they appreciate the importance of creating dissensions and divisions in Democracy's forces, and we are all too prone to divide.

In 1924, although they had no heavy artillery with which to bombard us, we nevertheless broke ranks before we had gotten close enough for them to see the whites of our eyes.

Is it possible, I wonder, that a great party, grounded in traditions of glory, a great party which has written nearly every permanent chapter of American law, is again to fall a victim to its own folly and blither about nonessentials, fight with passionate abandon over imaginary goblins and academic abstractions, and forget the substance which challenges our bravest and our best? Heaven forbid!

Surely in the conditions which surround us and which are observable upon the very surface, without even probing to the depths, we have glaring issues upon which to make successful appeal to the intelligence and virtue of America. In the favoritism which within seven short years has been wrought into law; in the tangled confusion following in the wake of corruption and shame; in the foreign policy, or lack of foreign policy, which has left us without a friend among the nations of the world; in the domestic distresses which all their cunning has not enabled them to cure because avarice forbade alleviation—surely these things summon us to find a firm and common ground upon which the legions of Democracy can stand and give lusty battle as in the victorious days of yore.

Democracy will not win grouped about a jumble of policies asserted as meeting the expediency of a fleeting hour. Democracy has won its fights when it had a battle flag which symbolized a system of principles fitted for the government of a free people in a republic (which is a democracy made practical) grounded upon a written constitution.

Democracy will never be destroyed; its philosophy too thoroughly permeates the world. And the party which espouses it stands in no danger of death from external forces. Its only danger lies within its own organism. It will not be killed, but it could commit suicide.

Democracy means respect for law and the implications of law; regard for the Constitution and the limitations of the Constitution; antagonism to governmental favoritism and the corrupting force of favoritism; enmity to privilege and the withering blight of privilege upon our institutions.

It means justice to the individual and, therefore, peace among the masses.

The application of its principles by some party constitutes the sole hope for the permanency of this democratic Republic.

Surely the Democratic Party—our Democratic Party—ought to be the one to apply democratic principles.

Its founder made it the instrumentality which rendered the Republic a democratic one.

Andrew Jackson revived it as it was about to become moribund and expanded it even beyond the hopes of its founder.

A long line of leaders, whose names are on the roll of immortals, have followed these and carried on, applying the principles of democracy to the solution of the Nation's vital questions.

Surely we of this demanding day will also carry on.

W. L. CLAYTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press of February 16 carries a statement to the effect that W. L. Clayton, of the firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co., has charged me with abusing my congressional privileges by making statements on the floor of the House which he says are untrue. I have not made a statement with reference to this matter that can not be amply substantiated by proof.

The principal charge which he denounces as false was to the effect that he said in a speech before members of the New York Cotton Exchange that firms other than his own could not hope to avoid loss in the cotton business unless they could successfully guess his mind. I said in my speech to which he refers that Mr. Clayton was quoted as having made this statement, and he comes out and not only denies it but takes occasion to denounce me for calling the country's attention to it. Let us see whether he made that statement or not.

I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. S. T. Hubbard, sr., dean of the cotton industry in New York and former president of the New York Cotton Exchange, whose son is president of the exchange now, in which he says:

268 PALISADE AVENUE, YONKERS-ON-HUDSON, N. Y.

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have not seen your speech in the House on Monday, though I have heard of it. To-day my eye was attracted to the inclosed statement given in the New York Times. I have known Mr. Clayton for many years. I have a very high opinion of him as a man and his ability as a cotton merchant. We do not always agree in our opinions, but when we differ it is without any feeling.

Cotton merchants soon learn that their opinions may be right or they may be wrong, so when they disagree their opinions are subject to the course of events and are not decided on any personal weight of opinion.

Mr. Clayton, however, has had a lapse of memory. He did make that statement. I heard it. I took it for part of my text, as I followed him in a speech to the assembled members of the exchange. I repeated it several times in my speech and he heard me repeat it. Mine was the last speech. I believe what I said and what he said turned the opinion of the members against him.

When the ballots on the amendments we were discussing were counted at the date set for voting we came within a very few votes of carrying by a two-thirds vote, as required by the by-laws. Mr. Clayton's statement has been quoted many, many times by the members who heard it. No stenographic notes were taken of any of the speeches—by direction of Mr. Harris, then presiding as president—although the exchange stenographer, Miss Wilson, was present.

After the meeting I said to many members that Mr. Clayton's remarks had defeated him, and I went so far as to say I thought in time that he would give a million dollars not to have made them.

I am also reliably informed that possibly 200 men will make affidavit that they heard Mr. Clayton make that statement.

I am not interested personally in Mr. Clayton, but I am interested in breaking up this gigantic monopoly in which certain large cotton firms have successfully conspired to control the cotton market, ruining the cotton farmers, and wrecking the fortunes of hundreds of men legitimately engaged in the cotton trade. [Applause.]

An investigation has been ordered by a Senate committee in which Anderson, Clayton & Co., George H. McFadden & Co., Pennefather & Co., and all other persons, firms, or corporations charged with complicity in this gigantic conspiracy may be required to give a full and thorough account of their transactions with reference to this unfortunate affair.

I stated in my speech a few days ago that under the Sherman Antitrust Act those who have lost money as the result of these unlawful manipulations of the cotton market may bring suit and recover their losses. My attention has been called to the fact that they may not only sue for the amount lost but may recover three times the amount of the actual damages.

But, Mr. Speaker, I shall not take up further time of the House on this proposition. The indications are now that new

charges and new evidence may be brought to light within the next few days that will far overshadow the revelations already made and the charges already preferred. [Applause.]

CORRECTIONS

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I have some corrections to make in the Record, only two of which I want to make from the floor. One, where in speaking of the Flathead Tribe of Indians, I am quoted as saying "the House is not totally informed," I should have said "the House is not totally uninformed."

Then, a subhead that I wrote, "Where is the denaturant that is harmless but effective," appears in the speech of the gentleman from Maryland.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the corrections will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] that the gentleman from Iowa may again suggest a method in which the Record can be corrected in a simpler way.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me say to the gentleman that my custom is to follow the course suggested by the gentleman from Iowa as to the bulk of the corrections, but there are times when it is only fair to other Members and to the Member himself to have the correction made in this public way. One of these corrections covers an error that might have caused embarrassment to the gentleman from Maryland without it appearing in the Record.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I have no objection to the correction, but I do not like to have one Member's attention called to the matter and another Member make corrections without having his attention called to it.

Mr. TILSON. Does not the gentleman think that the dividing line should be whether or not the correction if made would place the other Member engaged in the colloquy in an unfavorable light?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. One of these corrections was merely adding a syllable to a word, "uninformed" for "informed."

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; but it so happens that that little syllable was of importance. It was in an answer I was making in response to an attack that claimed that the House was uninformed. It was possibly through my own error.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, I was engaged on another important matter and did not hear the request, but the practice of the House is very well known, that minor corrections can be made and are made every day without taking up the time of the House by unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on February 10 the words "Department of Labor" are used and they should be "Labor Bureau, Incorporated." I ask unanimous consent that this may be changed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, this is another very clear example where the correction could be made by handing it to any one of the reporters, and it would appear corrected in the permanent Record.

Mr. CANFIELD. For the information of the gentleman I will say that I have been misquoted on this, and I ask that this correction be made to keep the Record straight, as it was the "Labor Bureau, Incorporated," that gave out the information referred to.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Does the gentleman mean to say that he has been misquoted by the press?

Mr. CANFIELD. I do not think the press misquoted me, but I have heard of it from other channels.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am not here to object to these requests. The only object I have in reserving the right to object was to call to the attention of the Members the rule that governs corrections of this kind, and to impress upon them the fact that they can be corrected with the Record clerk, or that the correction can be made by calling it to the attention of any one of the reporters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON NORTHERN PACIFIC LAND GRANTS

The SPEAKER. To fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Representative William N. Vaile, of Colorado, the Chair appoints on the Joint Committee on Northern Pacific Land Grants the gentleman from Utah, Hon. DON B. COLTON.

SUSPENSIONS

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, would it be agreeable to the Speaker to inform the House whether there will be any suspensions to-day, and what they will be, so that we may be prepared for them?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is always glad to inform any gentleman with respect to that. So far as the Chair is at present advised, he will recognize two motions to suspend the rules to-day, one in respect to the pension bill and the other for the extension of time with respect to soldiers' bonus. So far as the Chair is informed, that will be all.

Under the order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] for 15 minutes.

PROHIBITING THE EXPORTATION OF ARMS, ETC., TO BELLIGERENT NATIONS

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my purpose is to draw attention to a measure soon to be taken up for consideration by the House. It is a joint resolution, unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and as it is brief, I ask permission to append it to my remarks. The resolution declares in favor of the general policy of prohibiting the exportation to any nation at war with another nation of arms, munitions, or implements of war. The policy as declared is not applicable to a condition of civil war within a nation, but to a war between or among nations.

As the intention is to prevent any American citizen or interest from aiding or abetting a belligerent by directly or indirectly supplying it the articles in question, I can see that it would be wise to amend the resolution by going beyond the use of the mere term "exportation," so as to set forth the intent more definitely and deal more effectively with the evil which is designed to be remedied. I feel confident that to this end the committee will offer a perfecting amendment.

Whenever foreign nations embark in war the President issues a proclamation announcing that our Government will stand neutral. There is no statute requiring this, but it is done in accordance with the practice initiated at the beginning and which no President would now think of disregarding. The resolution provides that upon such a proclamation being made it shall forthwith be unlawful to export or attempt to export from this country to any belligerent the materials or implements of war specified in the resolution. A violation of the prohibition is made punishable by both fine and imprisonment in the penitentiary.

Of course, Congress would retain authority to remove the ban generally or in any particular instance, without any expression to that effect, but it was thought wise to advertise to the world, in some quarters of which our system is not understood, that Congress possesses such authority, and conceivably might exercise it in some appropriate case.

The committee spared no effort to enumerate carefully and exhaustively the things which are forbidden to be exported. In the enumeration is the list of articles some time ago formulated at Geneva, and to that list are added tanks and armored cars, aircraft meant for warfare, poisonous gases and acids, and there is an inclusive reference to any other articles or inventions prepared for use in warfare.

Our Government and people earnestly wish to do whatever is possible to make an end of war and, short of that, to minimize its scope and activities. Nevertheless, we regretfully confess that since the armistice was signed much less of a practical nature has been accomplished in that direction than is universally desired. The resolution proceeds on the theory that whatever may be the attitude of other nations in respect to the desirability of a more peaceful world, a plain duty attaches to our own undeniable attitude. In its spirit it is antagonistic to war as a legitimate method of settling international disputes, and on the contrary it breathes the very spirit of peace. It does not stop with the employment of words voicing a belief and hope, but in at least one broad field of opportunity it concretely substitutes the obligation to discourage war in the place of continuing a right of traffic which inevitably encourages and supports war. To that extent, it really outlaws war. It construes the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" so as to pledge ourselves not to assist the inhabitants of one nation in the business of killing the inhabitants of another nation. It is not designed to make any American his brother's keeper, but it is designed to prevent him from being an accessory to his brother's injury or murder.

I should not omit to say that the principle of the resolution had its origin with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. On the first day of the present session Mr. BURTON offered a resolution providing against the exportation of the instrumentalities of war to any aggressor nation making war on another nation in violation of its treaty obligations. To

this there were two objections: First, that it is often difficult to determine which of two nations is really the aggressor; and, second, that it is sometimes difficult to determine whether treaty obligations have been violated. Furthermore, the committee, after much deliberation, were convinced that a full step should be taken instead of a partial and uncertain step, and so the resolution was framed free of the limitation originally attached.

There is a powerful argument in favor of the proposal deducible from our own history and the provisions of existing statutes. Neutrality is the most progressive branch of international law, but the progress was not swift or sure until this Government was founded. It was the action of our Government in its earliest days which established, or, if not that, courageously defined and enforced the doctrine that a nation should remain neutral toward nations at war with each other. The service rendered the world by Washington in applying that doctrine is one of his many great contributions to the welfare of mankind and throughout the subsequent period there has been steady adherence by this Nation to the principle of neutrality. That principle will be logically and wisely extended by the enactment of this resolution. But there is something else: During that period statutes have been passed and are now in effect extending the doctrine of Government neutrality to our citizens within a certain sphere of action. These statutes, which need not be detailed, forbid citizens under heavy penalties to enter the war service of a foreign nation with which we are at peace; to fit out expeditions in this country for participation or assisting in carrying on war against a nation with which we are at peace, and from furnishing equipment to the naval vessels of a belligerent nation entering any of our ports. These statutes command our citizens to observe a measure of neutrality. What we are now asking is that their complete neutrality shall be insured. We ask for a statute to penalize the exportation from this country and the intention is to penalize the sale in this country for the direct and indirect use of a belligerent of the primary means of warfare. Under the operation of the law whose enactment is asked, the United States would hereafter cease to be a reservoir from which belligerent nations might obtain a supply of the agencies of bloodshed and destruction. No one disapproves the Government itself standing neutral. No one disapproves compelling the citizens to be neutral to the extent provided by the statutes mentioned. That being the situation, how can anyone reasonably combat the proposition that neutrality to the extent contemplated by this resolution, should be enjoined on the citizen?

Should it be argued that the proposal is a radical departure from the prevailing practice in the Old World, as well as here, the reply is that war has taken on a more serious aspect because of its increasingly destructive character and that any expedient is justified, even though it may be considered radical, which gives any promise of preventing or diminishing the evils of war.

Should it be argued that to stop the traffic in the manner proposed might lead the nations of the Old World, recognizing their inability to obtain war supplies here, to incur more expense in accumulating them for use in case of need, the reply is that what they may do in that direction is their own business, and an additional reply is that it is more probable, since no belligerent will be able to look to this country for assistance in carrying on war, that the law would result in greater exertion being made by the nations across the sea to reduce expenditures in preparing for war by the limitation of armaments and otherwise.

Should it be argued that to stop the traffic in the manner proposed might slow down the manufacture of war material necessary for our own use in the event of being brought into war, the reply is that the most competent and wealthy nation on earth is not entitled to depend on keeping itself prepared by facilitating in times of peace the destruction of people who for some reason have been doomed to suffer the horrors of armed conflict. The manufacture of war supplies in the United States is not an infant industry requiring protection at the expense of unfortunate people of other nations. And it certainly does not deserve protection for the purpose of any person or group being enabled to profit from a traffic which can not be thought of otherwise than as the most sordid species of homicide—homicide for a money consideration.

Should it be argued that if the law is enacted and then in some instance Congress, in order to save a weak nation from cruel injustice, or possibly in order to safeguard the interests of this country, should lift the embargo in its application to some belligerent, our Government might be charged with practically waging war against the adversary belligerent, the reply is that we are strong enough to risk any such possibility, and that we must not forever take counsel of our apprehension and fears

if we are to exert ourselves effectively for the promotion of peace.

Long ago a question was asked about priority in the matter of individual greatness, and the answer was: "Whosoever will be the chief among you, let him be the servant of all." This conception is as true of nations as of individuals. It is the ability and willingness of our Nation to serve which marks its greatness. The measure which I have discussed can work no detriment to our own interests, but by its enactment we can perform our duty of rendering some service to humanity. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Does this resolution referred to by the gentleman from Virginia prohibit the importation of these same articles into this country by neutrals?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. No; it does not.

Mr. DENISON. Does not the gentleman think it ought to, in order to be consistent.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Personally I would have no objection to that at all, though I do not think it of practical consequences because it would be very rarely the case that any importations would be desired.

Mr. DENISON. If our country should get into war with some other nation, the tendency would be for neutrals to want to send their war supplies to our country. If by law we are going to prohibit our citizens from selling war supplies in other countries, ought we not also to prohibit the citizens of other countries from selling war supplies in our country?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I think the gentleman's suggestion is well worth consideration. I think we should put the bars up just as far as possible against traffic that makes for the promotion of war.

Mr. DENISON. We at least ought to impose the same prohibition on the citizens of other countries that we seek to impose upon the citizens of our own country.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. So far as we can reach the citizens of other countries, or reach the citizens of this country.

Mr. DENISON. We can reach the citizens of other countries by prohibiting the import as well as the export.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. We can. It is a point which deserves to be thought about.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

H. J. Res. 183, Seventieth Congress, first session, Report No. 492
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 25, 1928.

Mr. BURTON introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed. January 30, 1928, referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Joint resolution to prohibit the exportation of arms, munitions, or implements of war to belligerent nations

Resolved, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States of America to prohibit the exportation of arms, munitions, or implements of war to any nation which is engaged in war with another.

SEC. 2. Whenever the President recognizes the existence of war between foreign nations by making proclamation of the neutrality of the United States, it shall be unlawful, except by the consent of the Congress, to export or attempt to export any arms, munitions, or implements of war from any place in the United States or any possession thereof, to the territory of either belligerent or to any place if the ultimate destination of such arms, munitions, or implements of war is within the territory of either belligerent or any military or naval force of either belligerent.

SEC. 3. As used in this joint resolution the term "arms, munitions, or implements of war" means—

1. Rifles, muskets, carbines.

2. (a) Machine guns, automatic rifles, and machine pistols of all calibers; (b) mountings for machine guns; (c) interrupter gears.

3. Projectiles and ammunition for the arms enumerated in Nos. 1 and 2 above.

4. Gun-sighting apparatus, including aerial gun sights and bomb sights, and fire-control apparatus.

5. (a) Cannon, long or short, and howitzers, of a caliber less than 5½ inches (15 centimeters); (b) cannon, long or short, and howitzers, of a caliber of 5½ inches (15 centimeters) or above; (c) mortars of all kinds; (d) gun carriages, mountings, recuperators, accessories for mountings.

6. Projectiles and ammunition for the arms enumerated in No. 5 above.

7. Apparatus for the discharge of bombs, torpedoes, depth charges, and other kinds of projectiles.

8. (a) Grenades; (b) bombs; (c) land mines, submarine mines, fixed or floating; depth charges; (d) torpedoes.

9. Appliances for use with the above arms and apparatus.

10. Bayonets.

11. Tanks and armored cars; aircraft designed for purposes of warfare.

12. Arms and ammunition not specified in the above enumeration prepared for use in warfare.

13. Poisonous gases, acids, or any other articles or inventions prepared for use in warfare.

14. Component parts of the articles enumerated above if capable of being used in the assembly or repair of the said articles or as spare parts.

SEC. 4. Whoever exports or attempts to export any arms, munitions, or implements of war in violation of the provisions of this resolution shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$10,000, and by imprisonment not exceeding two years. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to report any such violation of the provisions of this resolution to the United States district attorney for the district wherein the violation is alleged to have been committed.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

MILITARY RESERVATIONS IN ALASKA

The first business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9031) to provide further for the disposal of abandoned military reservations in the Territory of Alaska, including Signal Corps stations and rights of way.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when any lands included within the limits of abandoned or useless military reservations, including Signal Corps stations or rights of way, and not otherwise withdrawn or used for a public purpose, in the Territory of Alaska, have been or may be placed hereafter by order of the President under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for disposition, the Secretary may proceed to cause the survey, appraisal, and disposition of such lands or any portions thereof in the manner provided by the act of July 5, 1884 (23 Stat. L. 103), or the Secretary may, in his discretion, direct the restoration of such lands or any portions thereof to disposition under the public land laws applicable to the Territory of Alaska: *Provided,* That any person locating, entering, or acquiring title to any such lands shall, in addition to the regular fees, commissions, and purchase price of the land, pay the appraised price of any improvements placed thereon by the Government.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to prescribe all necessary rules and regulations for administering the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

HOSPITAL AT DAYTON SOLDIERS' HOME

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 132) authorizing the erection of a sanitary fireproof hospital at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Dayton, Ohio.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I understand at the last time this calendar was called gentlemen in charge of this bill were waiting to get some statement from the authorities. Until that information is received I shall be obliged to object.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection until the author of the bill has opportunity to make a statement later in the day?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. SPEAKS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that further consideration of this bill go over until a little later in the day, when the author of the bill is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over until later. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CLAIMS OF POSTMASTERS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 325) repealing existing law requiring the Postmaster General to report action taken on claims of postmasters.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ADDITIONAL JUDGES, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9200) to provide for the appointment of three additional judges of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DYER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this bill, with the one following, namely, H. R. 5774, may go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BLANTON. Then just one objection will take them off, but if it is objected to now it will require three.

Mr. DYER. I suggest to the gentleman from Texas that there has been some arrangement between the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] and one of his colleagues in New York.

Mr. BLANTON. It can be put back on the calendar under the general rule.

Mr. DYER. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

PAY TO DEPENDENT RELATIVES OF NURSES OF THE REGULAR ARMY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 238) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the payment of six months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relatives of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct," approved December 17, 1919, so as to include nurses of the Regular Army.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved December 17, 1919 (41 Stat. L. 367), entitled "An act to provide for the payment of six months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct," shall apply to nurses of the Regular Army to the same extent and under the same conditions as to officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be ordered engrossed and read a third time and passed.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I thought it was generally understood that gentlemen who had bills involving citations of statutes would offer amendments to show in parenthesis in what part of the code such act proposed to be amended could be found.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I will say in reply to the gentleman that I did not hear of any such suggestion or understanding. The report has been filed for some time on this bill, and I am not prepared to give the code reference.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I do not intend to object, although I am trying to impress gentlemen here, as I did the other day, with the importance of having that reference made in order that people who read these amendments will know in what section of the code they will fall.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I want to suggest that it is very desirable to have these references, but it seems to me the only way we can get them is to devise some method by which some clerk can be employed to go through these bills and have these references ready, so that they may be proposed as amendments, when bills come up. Members of the House have told me that they have a great deal of difficulty in finding statutes in the code. There is no available index, as I am informed, through which cross references can be made.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman was not present, I think, a few days ago when I called attention of Members to a very complete index.

I then called attention to the fact that we have a very complete index in the legislative service of the Library of Congress, which was prepared by and is in charge of Mr. W. H. McLennan, who rendered valuable service in codifying the laws as they appear in the United States code. He tells me that he has card indexes showing where every act of Congress in existence prior to December 7, 1925, can be found in the United States Code of Laws, and if gentlemen want to know where the acts they are seeking to amend can be found, all they have to do is to call up Mr. McLennan and he will be glad to give them references to the code.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Let me say this: I heard the gentleman's remarks upon that subject and I find that there is only one copy of that index in existence, the one that is held by the legislative service. Of course, it is quite inconvenient for Members to go there to obtain their information. What the gentleman suggests should be done, and I am trying to suggest a way in which it might be done. However, instead of expecting Members of the House to secure that information themselves, I think it would be well if some one could arrange to have the information here when the Consent Calendar is called.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Just this further suggestion: I have not objected to a single bill on this ground, and I am not going to object now, but the observation made by the gentleman from Illinois, that we should have a clerk look after this, suggests the idea that possibly we should have additional help in our legislative drafting service to assist Members in finding these references.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That would be the place to have it done.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has suggested two means of getting this information. Both of them are good, so why go further. The office of our legislative counsel has been extended and enlarged time and again and they are the most accommodating men you ever saw. If any Member will take his bill there they will tell him in a short time what the reference should be, so why discuss this question on the floor every time the Consent Calendar comes up?

Mr. RAMSEYER. The reason for it is that there still appear to be some Members who do not know that we are trying to have references to the code inserted in these bills which amend statutes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has suggested two means whereby we can get the information.

Mr. McSWAIN. This report was prepared some time ago and before the gentleman's suggestion had been made. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion and I commend him for it. However, we did not think it would be well to reprint the report and as far as I am concerned I have my hands full of other things.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. I would like to have the gentleman's advice on this proposition: A bill has just been passed which I introduced at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, the first bill on to-day's calendar. It refers to the act of July 5, 1884. I endeavored to locate that in the code and I found it was in title 43, chapter 26. In referring to that act I would have to say title 43, chapter 26, sections 1071, 1072, 1073, and 1074, because there are acts of a later date in that same chapter, and I thought I would be safe in doing that; but I looked toward the end of that title and I was perplexed, because I found a later section that in some way tied in three preceding sections passed at a later date than the act of 1884. Therefore I am at a loss to know how to refer to them.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I realize there are some difficulties; but if the gentleman had followed the remarks I made the other day, he would know that I tried to point out a way making it perfectly safe to refer only to the code in amending statutes. When you can not find a reference to the code or where there is a situation such as the gentleman calls attention to, present-

ing insurmountable difficulties, of course, you may have to stick to the old method.

Mr. SINNOTT. I thought it might be solved in this way: Not referring to the section at all but referring to the title and chapter, although there are other laws in that same title.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That would help and I admit would be better than nothing. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CARLISLE BARRACKS RESERVATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5635) to amend the act approved June 7, 1924, authorizing the Secretary of War to sell a portion of the Carlisle Barracks Reservation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the bill is drawn in such a way as to make me a little uncertain.

Mr. McSWAIN. It is really to authorize a purchase.

Mr. CRAMTON. Have they that authority now, or does this constitute an appropriation? The report is not full enough to let one know what the present authority is.

Mr. McSWAIN. The original act which is referred to here—the act of June 7, 1924—authorized the sale of two parcels of land it was intended to purchase.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me ask this: They are now authorized to sell certain land. Are they authorized to use the proceeds of that sale in buying any other land?

Mr. McSWAIN. Exactly.

Mr. CRAMTON. They are authorized to use those proceeds?

Mr. McSWAIN. Exactly.

Mr. CRAMTON. If they are already authorized to use those proceeds, I am not going to object to this authority.

Mr. McSWAIN. This act is necessary because the original authorization provided for the purchase of two tracts. When they went to buy and proceeded to condemn they found that the price fixed by the condemnation jury for one tract was more than double the sum available, so they abandoned the purchase of one tract and are now purchasing the other tract, which is the more desirable at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 7, 1924, entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to sell a portion of Carlisle Barracks Reservation" (43 Stat. L. 657), is hereby amended by revoking the authority in that act to purchase the Henderson tract of land and to authorize the proceeds derived from the sale of part of the tract known as farm No. 2, authorized to be sold by said act, to be applied to the purchase of the so-called Alexander tract of land adjacent to Carlisle Barracks Reservation and authorized to be purchased by said act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FORT BELKNAP RESERVATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9994) to reimburse certain Indians of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., for part or full value of an allotment of land to which they were individually entitled.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$45,716.80 to reimburse the following-named Indians or their heirs, if deceased, in the amounts following their respective names as full compensation for the value of an allotment of land on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., to which they were individually entitled under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. p. 1355): Richard O'Bryan, \$1,516.80; Bessie O'Bryan Dohmeyer, \$3,400; Eva O'Bryan, \$3,400; Kate O'Bryan Wernicke, \$3,400; Gerald O'Bryan, \$200; Barbara E. O'Bryan, \$200; John F. O'Bryan, \$3,400; Rose Ellen O'Bryan, \$3,400; Archie DuBoise, \$1,600; Henry Bradley, \$1,000; George Bradley, \$1,600; William Bradley, \$1,600;

Josephine First Raised, \$1,600; Mary First Raised, \$1,600; Bryan First Raised, \$800; Elizabeth Parker, \$3,400; Charles W. Parker, \$3,400; Ambrose Parker, \$3,400; Darlene E. Parker, \$3,400; Adell Strike, \$200; Rosella O'Bryan, \$1,600; Daisy Adams, \$1,600: *Provided*, That the funds authorized to be appropriated hereby shall remain under the control of the Secretary of the Interior and may be paid to the Indians in cash or expended, in his discretion, in the purchase of inherited or other trust lands within the Fort Belknap Reservation for which patents shall be issued of the same form as those held by other Indians of the reservation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to strike out certain language. I understand the amendment is agreeable to the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: On page 2, in line 14, after the word "hereby," strike out "shall remain under the control of the Secretary of the Interior and," and in line 16 strike out "in his discretion."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROYALTIES ON MINERALS FROM LEASED INDIAN LANDS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8831) to provide for the collection of fees from royalties on production of minerals from leased Indian lands.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to collect a reasonable fee, not exceeding 3 per cent, from Indian lessors for moneys collected as royalties on production from the leasing of restricted Indian lands for mining purposes, the amounts collected to be covered into the Treasury subject to appropriation by Congress for necessary supervision in connection with the execution, development, and operation of leases: *Provided*, That no collection shall be made from Indian lessors where agency expenses are paid entirely from tribal funds.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: On page 1, in line 9, after the word "Treasury," strike out "subject to appropriation by Congress for" and insert "as reimbursement for expenditures for"; and on page 2, in line 2, after the word "of," insert the word "such"; and in line 3 strike out "no collection shall be made from Indian lessors"; and in line 4, after the word "funds," insert a comma and the following language: "such amounts shall be covered into the Treasury and credited to the tribal funds from which such expenses were paid."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the principal effect of this amendment, outside of some change of form, will be to permit a tribe to be reimbursed for expenses of supervision of a lease belonging to an individual of the tribe. The change I have suggested is agreeable to the bureau, and I think to the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF INDIANS OCCUPYING RAILROAD LANDS IN ARIZONA, NEW MEXICO, OR CALIFORNIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8293) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all of the provisions of an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913, and amended by

the act of April 11, 1916, and the act of June 30, 1919, be, and the same are hereby, extended to March 4, 1929: *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall apply only in cases where it is shown that the lands were actually occupied in good faith by Indians prior to March 4, 1913, and the applicants are otherwise entitled to receive such tracts in allotment under existing law but for the grant to the railroad company.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, in line 8, strike out the figures "1929" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "1931."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESERVE SUPPLIES OR EQUIPMENT HELD BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7752) to limit the issue of reserve supplies or equipment held by the War Department.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

DEFERRED-PAYMENT SALES OF INDIAN ALLOTTED LANDS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8291) to amend section 1 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L. 855), "An act to provide for determining the heirs of deceased Indians, for the disposition and sale of allotments of deceased Indians, for the leasing of allotments, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when any Indian to whom an allotment of land has been made, or may hereafter be made, dies before the expiration of the trust period and before the issuance of a fee-simple patent, without having made a will disposing of said allotment as hereinafter provided, the Secretary of the Interior, upon notice and hearing, under such rules as he may prescribe, shall ascertain the legal heirs of such decedent, and his decision thereon shall be final and conclusive. If the Secretary of the Interior decides the heir or heirs of such decedent competent to manage their own affairs, he shall issue to such heir or heirs a patent in fee for the allotment of such decedent; if he shall decide one or more of the heirs to be incompetent, he may, in his discretion, cause such lands to be sold: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of the Interior shall find that the lands of the decedent are capable of partition to the advantage of the heirs, he may cause the shares of such as are competent, upon their petition, to be set aside and patents in fee to be issued to them therefor. All sales of lands allotted to Indians authorized by this or any other act shall be made under such rules and regulations and upon such terms as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, and he shall require a deposit of 10 per cent of the purchase price at the time of the sale. Should the purchaser fail to comply with the terms of sale prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, the amount so paid shall be forfeited; in case the balance of the purchase price is to be paid on such deferred payments, a further amount, not exceeding 15 per cent of the purchase price, together with all interest paid on such deferred installments, may be so forfeited for failure to comply with the terms of the sale. All forfeitures shall inure to the benefit of the heirs. Upon payment of the purchase price in full, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be issued to the purchaser patent in fee for such land: *Provided*, That the proceeds of the sale of inherited lands shall be paid to such heir or heirs as may be competent and held in trust subject to use and expenditure during the trust period for such heir or heirs as may be incompetent as their respective interests shall appear: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to issue a certificate of competency, upon application therefor, to any Indian, or in case of his death to his heirs, to whom a patent in fee containing restrictions on alienation has been or may hereafter be issued, and such certificate shall have the effect of removing the restrictions on alienation contained in such patent: *Provided further*, That hereafter any United States Indian agent, superintendent, or other disbursing agent of the Indian Service may deposit Indian moneys, individual or tribal, coming into his hands as custodian, in such bank or banks as he may select: *Provided*, That the bank or banks so selected by him shall first execute to the said disbursing agent a bond, with approved surety, in such amount as will properly safeguard the funds to be deposited. Such bonds shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, at the end of line 2, insert the following: "be and the same is amended so as to read as follows."

Then, in the first line, strike out the words "to amend" and insert the word "that."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE AND ROAD ON THE HOOPA VALLEY RESERVATION, CALIF.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 441) to authorize an appropriation to pay half of the cost of a bridge and road on the Hoopa Valley Reservation, Calif.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, this bill and another on the Consent Calendar for the construction of a bridge and road on Indian reservations is entirely unnecessary from a legislative point of view. There is ample authority for appropriations for this purpose. If this bill passes, there will still need to be an appropriation to make it effective. The question as to the construction of roads across Indian reservations out of public funds is one very embarrassing to our committee, because we realize the needs that frequently exist. On the other hand, we do not desire to see the Indian Bureau appropriation loaded down, charged with appropriations for roads for the public. The appropriations for the Indian Bureau ought to be used for service for the Indians.

This road and that in another bill on the calendar would serve as precedents that would encourage many other projects to come in. I personally believe that provision should be made elsewhere for such projects. The other day I went before the Committee on Roads in favor of a bill introduced by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON] proposing that provision be made for building roads on the public domain where it is necessary to connect up important highways.

It seems to me that this project should wait legislation of that kind and be taken care of when they would not be charged to the Indian Bureau, because as I say there is ample law now. I would feel obliged to object to the bill much as I regret it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is the effect of the proviso in this bill "That before any money is spent hereunder said State or county shall agree in writing to maintain the bridge and road without expense to the United States or Indians," in the present law?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have no doubt it could be arranged by limitation—that none of the money should be spent until the State or county should agree to the maintenance of the bridge and road without expense to the United States or the Indians.

Mr. LEA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. LEA. With reference to the present authority, I have been under the impression which I got from the department that it is without legal authority. A similar road was denied by the department, although it was in favor of it, until a law was passed authorizing it. If it is conceded that the road is needed, of course, there is no injury done by passing the law. My information from the department is that authorization by such a law is necessary.

Mr. CRAMTON. The road is on an Indian reservation, and under the Snyder Act there is authority to make this appropriation. How keen the need is I am not informed. If there is need of it, it seems to me that the proper course is for the Indian Bureau to submit the item to the Bureau of the Budget and let the Bureau of the Budget submit it to the Appropriations Committee and let it be handled in that way. In the meantime I have sought this opportunity to emphasize the need for legislation of different character that will permit the Bureau of Public Roads to use funds not charged to the Indian Bureau for the construction of roads across Indian reservations where they are not needed by the Indians.

Mr. LEA. I think the gentleman will recognize how uncertain is the hope of taking the course he suggests by depending on general legislation, for there is no bill before Congress—

Mr. CRAMTON. There is a bill, and it is under hearing, and I am hopeful it will become a law.

Mr. LEA. I would like the gentleman's attention on the merits of this bill. If you will read the letter of the department, I think the gentleman will see the need of it.

This road is not part of the State highway system. The State highway system runs entirely to the south. Half of the pro-

ductive lands on this reservation are on the opposite side of the river from the highway connection, and during a large portion of the year there is no way of crossing the river. It is a torrential mountain stream. Even the ferry can not be used during quite a portion of the year. During a large part of the year they are dependent upon the ferry, which is a material item of expense. The report indicates the income of these Indians would probably be increased even up to 50 per cent if the bridge were provided.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is already authority of law for the appropriation, and that is all that this bill will do. The gentleman will still have to get his appropriation. I suggest that he proceed directly to get his appropriation.

I suggest that he get his estimate up for consideration in the deficiency appropriation bill that will be passed next June.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to pass over the bill temporarily. I want to look into the question of the legal authority.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SALE OF TIMBER ON OREGON & CALIFORNIA RAILROAD

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8307) amending section 5 of the act approved June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 218), so as to authorize the sale of timber on class 3 of the Oregon & California Railroad and Coos Bay wagon-road grant lands.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 218), and as amended and extended by section 3 of the act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. L. 1779), be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:

"And provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion and in the manner now provided for the sale of timber on lands of class 2, sell the timber on any of the lands of class 3 which at the time application to purchase the timber is filed have been subject to entry for a period of at least two years and are not embraced in an application or entry, such sale of the timber not to preclude the disposal of the land under laws applicable thereto, subject to the right of the purchaser of the timber to cut and remove the same."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CARSON NATIONAL FOREST

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8824) to provide for the protection of the watershed within the Carson National Forest from which water is obtained for the Taos Pueblo, N. Mex.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw by Executive order or proclamation, from any or all forms of entry or appropriation under the land laws of the United States, any lands of the United States within the watershed of the Rio Pueblo de Taos, Carson National Forest, N. Mex., from which the Indians of the Taos Pueblo obtain water for irrigation and domestic purposes: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, promulgate regulations to govern the use and occupancy of lands withdrawn under the provisions hereof, and to protect said lands from any act or condition which would impair the purity or volume of the water flowing therefrom.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FORT HALL INDIAN RESERVATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 308) authorizing an appropriation for the survey and investigation of the placing of water on the Michaud division and other lands in the Fort Hall Indian Reservation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000 for surveys and investigation to determine the feasibility and cost of irrigating the Michaud division and other lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation: *Provided,* That said sum, or any part thereof that may be expended for this work, shall be reimbursable when this or any other division of the project for which surveys shall be made hereunder is adopted for construction under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, and there is hereby created a first lien against all such lands that may be brought within said division or divisions of the Fort Hall project, which lien shall attach to all lands benefited from the date of the adoption of the particular unit of the project under which such lands lie for construction, and said lien shall include all expenditures made therefor and shall be recited in any patent issued after the adoption of any such unit of the project for construction.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TIMBER CUT ON COOS BAY WAGON ROAD GRANT LAND

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 158) to amend chapter 137 of volume 39 of the United States Statutes at Large, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sentence in lines 17 to 20, page 220 of volume 39, United States Statutes at Large, chapter 137, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, reading as follows: "The timber thus purchased may be cut and removed by the purchaser, his heirs or assigns, within such period as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, which period shall be designated in the patent," be amended to read as follows: "The timber thus purchased may be cut and removed by the purchaser, his heirs or assigns, within such period and under such rules, regulations, and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, which period and conditions shall be designated in the patent."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LASSEN VOLCANIC NATIONAL PARK

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8311) to provide for the naming of a mountain or peak within the boundaries of the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., in honor of Hon. John E. Raker, deceased.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this peak a name at the present time?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. No; it is an unnamed peak.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Geographic Board is hereby authorized and directed to name a prominent mountain or peak within the boundaries of the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., in honor of the late John E. Raker, deceased, a former Member of Congress of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 4, strike out the words "and directed," and in the same line, after the word "name," insert the word "permanently."

The committee amendments were agreed to; and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

POSTMASTER GENERAL NEW

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, unfortunately the Postmaster General, Mr. Harry S. New, has not been in very good health. When I found that he was going to Florida I immediately wrote him and congratulated him upon selecting Florida and gave him the name of many of my friends down there. I know that my colleagues will be interested in a letter that I have just received from Mr. New, which reads as follows:

KEY WEST, FLA., February 17, 1928.

Hon. W. J. SEARS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SEARS: I very much appreciate your note of the 15th, which is before me this morning. I am sure I have made no mistake in selecting Key West as the place to come for relief from the temporary illness by which I have been incapacitated. The skies are bright, the temperature delightful, the people congenial, and everything that could have been done to speed my recovery has been done for me. At present my social activities are limited, but I hope to be able to see and meet your friends before I get away from Key West.

With many thanks for your kindly expressions and with best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. NEW.

This morning I wired Mr. New, stating that I hoped and believed his health would continue to rapidly improve, and that I was glad that he has found I had not overdrawn the picture of Florida's wonderful climate and the hospitality of our people. I added that I also hoped before he returned to Washington he would have a chance to make an investigation and also find that I had not overdrawn the congested postal conditions down there. I know that the Members of the House join me in the expression of the hope for a speedy recovery on the part of Mr. New. [Applause.]

GRANT OF ISLANDS TO OREGON FOR PARK PURPOSES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1193) granting certain rocks or islands to the State of Oregon for park purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the State of Oregon for use and maintenance for public park purposes those certain rocks or islands locally known as Castle, Tourist, and Elephant Rocks, situated in the Pacific Ocean near the town of Seal Rock and located approximately in fractional section 25, township 12 south, range 12 west, Willamette meridian, Oregon, on condition that same be maintained in their present condition as natural monuments or objects of scenic interest. In the event of failure on the part of the State to comply with the conditions imposed in this act title shall revert to the United States, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to determine the facts and declare such forfeiture and such revision and restore said lands to the public domain, such order of the Secretary to be final and conclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

TESTING PLANT OF AIR CORPS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7008) to authorize appropriations for the completion of the transfer of the experimental and testing plant of the Air Corps to a permanent site at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES], is now in a hospital, and he asked me to give some attention to this bill; and I have here a memorandum from him and a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs from the Secretary of War in relation to the matter. I will ask to have the memorandum of Mr. JAMES read, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting the letter from the Secretary of War. If consent is given to the consideration of the bill, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. If it is going to take all that reading and the consideration of an amendment, I shall have to object. We have 123 bills on the calendar waiting to be disposed of.

The SPEAKER. It will require three objections.

Mr. CRAMTON. I hope the gentleman will not embarrass me in my effort to help my colleague. The amendments are very brief. I ask unanimous consent to insert both the memorandum and the letter without reading.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I should like to hear the reading of it. It is a removal to some place in Ohio. Why remove it?

Mr. CRAMTON. The removal is under way. Something like \$2,000,000 is either already appropriated or nearly expended, and this is to complete the transaction.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the document referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the documents referred to:

MEMORANDUM

H. R. 7008, Wright Field bill, calls for \$1,200,000. The Director of the Budget was willing to approve for this amount, but as there was \$300,000 in the Army appropriation bill which passed the House, I suggested he make it \$900,000, the amount needed to complete.

To move from McCook Field to Wright Field involved an expenditure of \$3,000,000. Congress gave a substantial sum the first year, but since that time Congress has been giving them \$300,000 a year in the Army appropriation bill.

I have been out to Wright Field myself and think thousands of dollars can be saved if all money could be spent now.

Budget has had two representatives out there and they also agree to this.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1928.

Hon. JOHN M. MORIN,

Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MORIN: In compliance with your request of February 8, 1928, I am pleased to submit the following report on H. R. 7008.

The subject of the proposed legislation is "To authorize appropriations for the completion of the transfer of the experimental and testing plant of the Air Corps to a permanent site at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, and for other purposes."

The removal from McCook Field and reestablishment at Wright Field of the matériel division of the Air Corps is being carried out in annual increments under the general provisions of the five-year program. The estimated cost of completing this project is \$3,000,000, and the present status may be briefly stated as follows:

(a) A total of \$1,500,000 was appropriated and obligated prior to the end of the fiscal year 1927.

(b) The sum of \$300,000 was appropriated for the fiscal year 1928 and these funds already have been obligated for work to be completed during the current fiscal year.

(c) The Air Corps estimates for the fiscal year 1929 provide for an additional amount of \$300,000 for this project during that year.

(d) The total expenditure on this project to date is \$1,800,000, which leaves a balance of \$1,200,000 required for completion of the project—\$300,000 in 1929 and \$900,000 to be provided in subsequent years.

The authorization contained in H. R. 7008 is to cover all of the construction which now remains to be completed. This work is now being carried on by annual increments of \$300,000, as part of the five-year program, and as successive increments of funds become available the construction most urgently needed is undertaken during that year.

The proposed legislation has been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who advises that if H. R. 7008 be amended by reducing the total amount and the items specified therein, so as to bring the authorization down to \$900,000, it would not be in conflict with the financial program of the President.

I therefore recommend that the bill be amended so as to authorize an appropriation of \$900,000. In view of the limited time in which this report is to be made, I am unable to make any recommendation as to breakdown of items.

A supplementary report in which this is done will be prepared and submitted within the next few days.

If any additional information from the War Department is desired, I shall be pleased to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT F. DAVIS,
Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$1,200,000 to be expended for the completion of the transfer of the experimental and testing plant of the Air Corps to a permanent site at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, and the construction and installation thereon of the following technical buildings and utilities and appurtenances as may, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, be necessary:

Hangars, \$220,000; head house, \$40,000; fire-engine house, \$20,000; oil house, \$5,000; boiler house, \$320,000; shop extensions, \$40,000; roofs and walls on garage, foundry, radio laboratory, maintenance building, wind tunnels, oil house, and armament laboratory, \$210,000; utilidor extensions and pipe, \$44,000; heating equipment in shops, hangars, and miscellaneous buildings, \$38,000; electrical installations in shops and hangars, \$45,000; grading in building area, \$32,000; grading in flying field, \$80,000; completion of roads and paving, \$75,000; sidewalks, \$20,000; street lighting, \$20,000; completion of underground electrical distribution system, \$13,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 1, line 4, strike out "\$1,200,000" and insert "\$900,000," and on page 2, line 1, strike out the word "following," and on page 2, line 3, strike out the words "in the judgment of the Secretary of War," and on page 2, line 4, strike out the remainder of the bill, so that as amended the language will read:

"Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$900,000 to be expended for the completion of the transfer of the experimental and testing plant of the Air Corps to a permanent site at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, and the construction and installation thereon of the technical buildings and utilities and appurtenances as may be necessary."

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan what the purpose was in removing this plant, and where it was removed from? We are very much interested in the Air Corps now. We are spending \$4,000,000 on it.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is not a subject that I have studied at any length. To-day I am simply acting for my colleague Mr. JAMES. If the gentleman desires, the letter of the Secretary of War can be read, giving the statement of the Department. I do happen to know that \$1,500,000 has already been expended, and the appropriation just going through carries \$300,000 more. Nine hundred thousand dollars is needed to complete it. That is what this bill carries. Frankly, I will say to the gentleman that I do not see any necessity of passing this bill. I think there is already authority sufficient.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The Appropriations Committee has already made \$300,000 available?

Mr. CRAMTON. One million five hundred thousand dollars is already expended, and the bill going through carries \$300,000, and this \$900,000 is to complete it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is your reason for the reduction of the amount in the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is my reason for the reduction in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the resolution (H. J. Res. 39) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive, for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, two Chinese subjects, to be designated hereafter by the Government of China.

The title of the resolution was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to speak out of order for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, we are maintaining the Military Academy for the purpose of training officers for our Army. We want to give them the very best and most modern

military instruction possible. We want them to be the best military geniuses in the world in case of a war. Likewise we are maintaining the Naval Academy for the purpose of training naval officers, and I have never, in my 11 years in Congress, seen the wisdom of taking in foreign subjects and giving them the same training in the Naval Academy that we give our naval officers and of giving them the same training in our Military Academy that we give our own military officers, and let them know everything about our military training that our military men know and let them take back to their countries all of the knowledge about our naval training that our naval officers know. I think it ought to be stopped. But I realize it is hard to stop these bills.

I have incurred many times the hostile feeling of many of my colleagues by objecting to these bills on consent day, but I felt somebody ought to do it. I felt somebody ought to look into these bills carefully. We have on this floor now approximately 50 Members with a Consent Calendar of 123 bills to be called up. How many men have we here to object to them? I see my friend from Texas [Mr. BLACK]. He does good work on this calendar. We can depend on him in an emergency to object to real bad bills when they involve great big sums of money that affect the taxpayers. I see just one other man here, our friend from Michigan [Mr. HOOPER]. He objects to one now and then. Our friend from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] will object to them occasionally when they affect irrigation or Indians, but when you get away from irrigation and Indians he is as silent as the grave as to the rest of them.

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; the gentleman is mistaken. He will object when they affect prohibition.

Mr. BLANTON. Except as to the Members I have mentioned you can not find any other men on this floor who will get up and object to a bill. If you ask them why, they will say, "I have bills on the calendar myself; if I object to other bills I will make somebody mad and they will object to my bills." So you see it is necessary for somebody who is not afraid to incur the displeasure of his colleagues, to look into these bills and be willing to stand up here in the interest of the people and object when they are improper bills of bad policy.

It takes three objections to stop this bill. We have already educated seven Chinese subjects in the Military Academy. Is not that enough? We have educated them there and given them the same training given the officers in the United States Army and sent them back to China. Is not that enough? We have educated a number of them in the Naval Academy. We have educated subjects of Japan in both academies. We have educated subjects of other countries in both academies. It ought to stop. I wonder whether we can get three objections against this bill? And we must get three objections to the next bill also. What is the use of carrying it on further? I do not believe the American people want it done. If we do this for the Chinese minister and for Siam, how are we going to turn down the Japanese minister if he comes and asks the same favor? How are we going to turn down the other ministers of all other foreign countries when we continue the precedent? If we are not going to treat all the countries alike we ought not to grant this permission in this bill, or in the next bill, and I hope we can get three objections to each and stop it. I object for one, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

INSTRUCTION AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY OF TWO SIAMESE SUBJECTS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Joint Resolution 40, authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two Siamese subjects, to be designated hereafter by the Government of Siam.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BLANTON, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. McMILLAN objected.

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9286) authorizing the appropriation of \$65,000 to be expended by the American section, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, for the purpose of making a survey to fix the boundary between the United States and Mexico, between El Paso, Tex., and Fort Quitman, Tex., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, desiring, of course, at all times to save all the money possible for the Treasury and the further fact that this matter has already been appropriated for by the Appropriations Committee when I presented same to them some two weeks ago—and also prevailed upon the President and the Secretary of State to make an urgent request that this sum be appropriated for at the earliest possible moment in order to carry out a treaty, which means much to my home city of El Paso—El Paso and Hudspeth Counties and the entire United States, I ask that the bill lie on the table. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

IDAHO NATIONAL FOREST

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 142) to add certain lands to the Idaho National Forest, Idaho. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described areas be, and the same are hereby, included in and made a part of the Idaho National Forest, subject to all prior adverse rights; and the said lands shall hereafter be subject to all laws affecting national forests: All of the eastern two-thirds of townships 24 and 25 north, range 4 east, and all of townships 24 and 25 north, ranges 5 and 6 east, as are not already embraced in the Nezperce National Forest; all Boise meridian.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "forests," strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert: "All of the eastern two-thirds of townships 24 and 25 north, range 4 east, all of townships 24 north, ranges 5 and 6 east, except sections 7 to 10, inclusive, 15 to 22, inclusive, and 27 to 34, inclusive, of township 24 north, range 5 east, and all of townships 25 north, ranges 5 and 6 east, which are not already embraced in the Nezperce National Forest; all Boise meridian."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CHALLIS AND SAWTOOTH NATIONAL FORESTS, IDAHO

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 144) to add certain lands to the Challis and Sawtooth National Forests, Idaho.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to any valid existing claim or entry, all lands of the United States within the areas hereafter described be, and the same are hereby, added to and made parts of the Challis and Sawtooth National Forests, Idaho, to be hereafter administered under the laws and regulations relating to the national forests; and the provisions of the act approved March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), as amended, are hereby extended and made applicable to all other lands within said described areas:

West half section 6, west half section 8, west half section 17, west half section 20, township 8 north, range 14 east, Boise meridian; sections 1, 12, 13, 24, and 25, township 9 north, range 13 east, Boise meridian; west half section 7, west half section 18, west half section 19, west half section 30, west half section 31, township 9 north, range 14 east, Boise meridian; sections 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 23, and 24, township 10 north, range 12 east (unsurveyed), Boise meridian; section 1, east half section 2, west half section 6, section 7, east half section 11, sections 12, 13, 14, 18, and 19, west half northwest quarter, and south half section 20, south half southwest quarter, south half southeast quarter section 21, sections 23, 24, 25, and 26, south half northeast quarter, northwest quarter, south half section 27, sections 28, 29, 35, and 36, township 10 north, range 13 east, Boise meridian; lot 2 section 25, lots 4 and 5, northeast quarter southeast quarter, south half southeast quarter section 35, lots 1, 4, and 5, northeast quarter northeast quarter, south half northeast quarter, south half section 36, township 11 north, range 13 east, Boise meridian; lots 5, 6, 8, 12, and 13, south half southeast quarter section 30, lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, east half section 31, township 11 north, range 14 east, Boise meridian.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHALLIS NATIONAL FOREST

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6056) to provide for addition of certain land for the Challis National Forest.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described lands are hereby added to the Challis National Forest, Idaho, and made subject to all laws made applicable to national forests:

All unreserved lands lying south of Salmon River in townships 10 and 11 north, range 16 east, Boise meridian.

Township 10 north, range 17 east, Boise meridian: Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 22; west half section 23; sections 26, 27, and 34; west half section 35.

Township 10 north, range 18 east, Boise meridian: South half section 4; sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10; west half section 15; sections 16, 17, 18, 20, and 21.

Township 9 north, range 17 east, Boise meridian: Sections 3, 17, 20; south half section 23; sections 24, 25, and 26; east half section 27; sections 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36.

Township 9 north, range 18 east, Boise meridian: Sections 17 to 36, inclusive.

Township 9 north, range 19 east, Boise meridian: Sections 21 and 28 to 33, inclusive.

Township 8 north, range 17 east, Boise meridian: Sections 4, 5, 8, and 9.

Township 8 north, range 18 east, Boise meridian: Sections 1 to 5, inclusive.

Township 8 north, range 19 east, Boise meridian: Section 6.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "Idaho," insert the words "subject to any valid existing claim or entry."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WITHDRAWING FROM ENTRY CERTAIN PUBLIC LAND IN MONTANA FOR A NATIONAL PARK

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8110) withdrawing from entry the northwest quarter section 12, township 30 north, range 19 east, Montana meridian.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed now and taken up in about half an hour. One of the Members has asked for information from one of the departments on an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF HAWAIIAN ISLANDS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 141) to authorize the President to invite the Government of Great Britain to participate in the celebration of the Sesquicentennial of the Discovery of the Hawaiian Islands, and to provide for the participation of the Government of the United States therein.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii will celebrate, from August 15 to August 19, 1928, the Sesquicentennial of the Discovery of the Hawaiian Islands by Capt. James Cook; and

Whereas the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii has appropriated the sum of \$20,000 to meet the cost of conducting such ceremonies, and for the purpose of providing entertainment of delegates; and

Whereas in pursuance of a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, adopted by the senate thereof on April 14, 1927, and by the house of representatives thereof on April 16, 1927, the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii has requested the President "to extend a formal invitation to the Government of Great Britain, asking their participation by sending a man-of-war with delegates representing the Dominions most interested," and has asked that "the Federal Government send representatives for the occasion, with the presence of such units of the United States Fleet as may be spared": Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to extend a formal invitation

to the Government of Great Britain to participate in the said celebration by sending a man-of-war with delegates representing the Dominions most interested.

Sec. 2. That for the purpose of defraying the expense of participation by the Government of the United States in the said celebration, an appropriation of the sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized, to include transportation, subsistence, or per diem in lieu of subsistence (notwithstanding the provisions of any previous act), and such other expenses as the President shall deem proper.

By unanimous consent the whereases were stricken out.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALAVERAS BIG TREES, CALIFORNIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5545) granting certain lands to the State of California.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon conveyance to and acceptance by the State of California of either the North Calaveras Big Tree Grove, described as the west half of the southwest quarter of section 14; the east half of the southeast quarter; the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter; the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 15; the north half of the northeast quarter; the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter; the east half of the northwest quarter of section 22, township 5 north, range 15 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian; or, the South Calaveras Big Tree Grove, described as the south half of the northwest quarter; the north half of the southwest quarter; the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 28; the southeast quarter; the south half of the southwest quarter of section 29; the north half of the northeast quarter; the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter; the northwest quarter; the north half of the southwest quarter of section 32; the east half of the northeast quarter; the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter; the north half of the southeast quarter; the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter; the southwest quarter of section 31, township 5 north, range 16 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian; or, both of the aforesaid groves, and the dedication as a State park of the lands so conveyed and accepted by the State of California, within six years from the passage of this act, then the Secretary of the Interior shall, upon request of the Governor of California, and with the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture issue a patent to the State of California for the following-described lands: The southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 22; the north half of the southeast quarter of section 24; the north half; the southwest quarter; the west half of the southeast quarter of section 25; the east half of the west half, the southeast quarter, the south half of the northeast quarter of section 26; the north half of the northeast quarter of section 35, township 5 north, range 15 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian; the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 31, township 5 north, range 16 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian.

Sec. 2. That the conveyance hereby authorized shall be subject to the right of the United States to occupy or to authorize the occupancy of so much of the conveyed lands as may be required for rights of way for roads, trails, railroads, transmission lines, or conduits constructed and maintained by or under the United States: *Provided*, That the said State of California shall not have the right to sell or convey the land acquired under the provisions of this act, or any part thereof, or to devote said land to other than State park purposes, and if the said land is sold or conveyed or is used for other than State park purposes, contrary to the provisions of this act, the part so conveyed or used shall revert to the United States; the conditions and reservation herein provided for to be expressed in the patent.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 9, after the word "lines" strike out the word "or"; after the word "conduits" on page 3, line 9, insert the words "or other works"; on page 3, line 10, after the word "under" insert the words "the authority of"; and on page 3, line 19, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, gas, coal, or other mineral deposits found at any time in the land, and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UTAH NATIONAL PARK

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1312) to change the name of Utah National Park, the establishment of which is provided for by the act of Congress approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat., p. 593), to the "Bryce Canyon National Park," and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to know the reason for the change, that is all.

Mr. COLTON. This national park has always been known as Bryce Canyon. A bill was passed a year or so ago changing it to the Utah National Park.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Why Bryce Canyon?

Mr. COLTON. It is simply a local name. It is named after the man who first settled in that section, and everybody in that country knows it as Bryce Canyon.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I was simply looking after the interests of Bill Thompson. I was afraid it was another Bryce.

Mr. COLTON. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the area within the State of Utah described in the act of Congress approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 593), providing for the establishment of the Utah National Park, shall be, when established as a national park, known as the Bryce Canyon National Park.

Sec. 2. That the east half section 25, township 36 south, range 4 west; the east half southwest quarter section 20, and all of sections 21, 29, and 30, township 36 south, range 3 west; all of sections 24 and 25, township 37 south, range 4 west; and all of sections 19 and 30, township 37 south, range 3 west, Salt Lake meridian, be, and the same are hereby, excluded from the Powell National Forest and made a part of the Bryce Canyon National Park, subject to the provisions of the aforesaid act of Congress, approved June 7, 1924.

Sec. 3. That unsurveyed sections 28 and 33, township 36 south, range 3 west, and section 20, township 37 south, range 3 west, Salt Lake meridian, public lands of the United States, be, and the same are hereby, added to and made a part of the Bryce Canyon National Park, subject to the provisions of the aforesaid act of Congress, approved June 7, 1924.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWANCES OF CHAPLAIN AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6652) to fix the pay and allowances of chaplain at the United States Military Academy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, I would like to know something about the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. I can not recommend myself as being the best authority—

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman is the best authority on some things.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think I am, on what the gentleman refers to, if the gentleman will permit me, but this is not one of them.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is this for the purpose of furnishing quarters, or does it increase the salary?

Mr. CRAMTON. The report from the department, the gentleman will note, says:

The chaplain at the United States Military Academy shall, while so serving, receive a salary of \$4,000 per annum and be entitled to the same allowances with respect to public quarters, fuel, and light as those allowed to a captain.

I am in favor of the passage of the bill for the following reasons:

The office of chaplain at the United States Military Academy was established by the act of April 4, 1818. Importance, honor, and dignity are attached to the position. The responsibilities of the office have increased in proportion to the expansion of the Corps of Cadets, which has more than trebled in strength since the date (1896) of the last permanent legislation upon the subject.

The remuneration for the chaplain provided in the present law, act of February 18, 1896 (29 Stat. 8), is inadequate to the importance of the position and not commensurate with the work performed. Congress has recognized this fact by fixing the chaplain's pay at \$4,000 per annum in recent appropriation acts. The proposed legislation involves no change in the compensation now allowed; it is simply for the purpose of enacting into the permanent law a rate of pay for the chaplain equal to the amount prescribed in recent annual appropriation acts.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does the gentleman know how the salary compares with the salary of the chaplain at the Naval Academy?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the act of February 18, 1896, as provides that the chaplain at the United States Military Academy shall, while so serving, receive the same pay and allowances as a captain, mounted, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The chaplain at the United States Military Academy shall, while so serving, receive a salary of \$4,000 per annum and be entitled to public quarters and the same allowances with respect to fuel and light as those allowed to a captain."

With the following committee amendments:

Line 9, strike out the words "public quarters and." Line 10, after the words "respect to," insert the words "public quarters."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING A CLOUD ON TITLE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1425) an act to remove a cloud on title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby relinquishes all the right, title, and interest of the United States acquired by virtue of a marshal's deed dated August 21, 1848, in the following-described property situated in Harrison County, Miss., to wit: The west half southwest quarter section 30, township 7 south, range 10 west, and east half southeast quarter section 25, township 7 south, range 1 west, lying south of Bernards Bayou and containing about 150 acres.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUSTING DISPUTES OF CLAIMS ON FAULTY SURVEYS, LAKE COUNTY, STATE OF FLORIDA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5695) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to equitably adjust disputes and claims of settlers and others against the United States and between each other arising from incomplete or faulty surveys in township 19 south, range 26 east, Tallahassee meridian, Lake County, in the State of Florida.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to equitably adjust disputes and claims of settlers, entrymen, selectors, grantees, and patentees of the United States, their heirs or assigns, against the United States and between each other arising from incomplete or faulty surveys in township 19 south, range 26 east, and in sections 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 30, 31, township 19 south, range 27 east, Tallahassee meridian, Lake County, in the State of Florida, and to issue directly or in trust, as may be found necessary or advisable, patent to such settlers, entrymen, selectors, grantees, and patentees, their heirs or assigns, for land claimed through settlement, occupation, purchase, or otherwise in said described area, preserving, as far as he may deem equitable, to those claimants now in possession of public land the right to have patented to them the areas so occupied: *Provided*, That a charge of not less than the appraised value of the land, exclusive of any improvements placed thereon, be made for each acre or fraction thereof of Government land patented under the provisions of this act, except that adjustment may be effected by exchange of lands patented for lands substantially equal in area, in which event payment shall be required of the difference in appraised values where the value of the land owned by the Government exceeds that of the land offered in exchange: *Provided further*, That rights acquired subsequent to the withdrawal of December 23, 1925, shall not be recognized or be subject to adjustment hereunder.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept any and all conveyances of land and to cause all necessary surveys to be made to effect the purposes of this act. All adjustments hereunder shall conform to the approved plats of such survey or resurvey, and no other survey will be recognized.

SEC. 3. That in fixing the appraised price of such lands the Secretary of the Interior shall consider and give effect to the good faith and equities of the occupants of any of the areas found to be public land; and if the whole or any part of such land be within the corporate limits of the town of Tavares, the survey of the lots, blocks, streets, and alleys

shall be considered as executed under the provisions of section 2384, Revised Statutes, but as far as practicable shall conform to the existing surveys and plats of the lots in such town: *Provided*, That the Secretary may, in his discretion, issue a patent to Lake County, Fla., to not exceeding 1 acre upon which the county courthouse is located, such patent to provide that the land shall revert to the Government of the United States if the county sells any part thereof or devotes it to any use other than as a site for a courthouse and grounds.

SEC. 4. That the provisions of section 2382, Revised Statutes, as modified by sections 2384 and 2385, Revised Statutes, shall extend to all areas surveyed as within and a part of the town of Tavares, but any applicant may elect to proceed under section 1 of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS TO THE CABAZON WATER CO.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5687) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands to the Cabazon Water Co., issue patent therefor, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue patent to the Cabazon Water Co., a nonprofit corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of California and mutually owned by the citizens of the community of Cabazon, Riverside County, Calif., for the following tract of public land situated in the county of Riverside, State of California, to wit:

The north half of the southwest quarter of section 29 and the south half of the southeast quarter of section 20, township 2 south, range 2 east, San Bernardino base and meridian, for water-supply and water-protection purposes, upon payment thereof of the sum of \$1.25 per acre: *Provided*, That whenever said lands cease to be used for said purposes, then in that event title to said lands shall revert to the United States upon a finding of such failure by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That said patent shall contain a reservation to the United States of all gas, oil, coal, and other mineral deposits that may be found in such land and the right to the use of the land for extracting same under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided further*, That such patent shall contain a reservation of a right of way over and across said tract for a public road following substantially the location of the present roadway through Millard Canyon, said right of way to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. JAMES COOK MEMORIAL COLLECTION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 81) to authorize the coinage of silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of the Hawaiian Islands by Capt. James Cook and for the purpose of aiding in establishing a Capt. James Cook memorial collection in the archives of the Territory of Hawaii.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of the Hawaiian Islands by Capt. James Cook, and for the purpose of aiding in establishing a Capt. James Cook memorial collection in the archives of the Territory of Hawaii, there shall be coined in the mints of the United States silver 50-cent pieces to the number of 10,000, such 50-cent pieces to be of a standard troy weight, composition, diameter, and design as shall be fixed by the director of the mint and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, which said 50-cent pieces shall be legal tender in any payment of their face value.

SEC. 2. The coins herein authorized shall be issued only upon the request of the Cook Sesquicentennial Commission of Hawaii and in such numbers and at such times as they shall request upon payment by such commission to the United States of the par value of such coins.

SEC. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coinage, providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for security of the coin or for any other purpose, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein author-

ized: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparation of this coinage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOMEN IN THE WORLD WAR

The next business on the Consent Calendar was Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) authorizing an additional appropriation to be used for the memorial building provided for by a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution in relation to a monument to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the United States of America, its insular possessions, and the District of Columbia in the World War," approved June 7, 1924.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is proposing a gift of \$50,000 to supplement the former gift of \$150,000. There is nothing in the report to show that this has been submitted to the Budget, whether or not it is in accordance with the President's financial program, and I am obliged to object.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold the objection for a moment?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. LUCE. My understanding is that it has been submitted to the Director of the Budget.

Mr. CRAMTON. If there is anything in the report to that effect I have overlooked it.

Mr. LUCE. If it is not in the report I overlooked putting it there.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have the report before me and I do not see anything in it stating that fact.

Mr. LUCE. It is quite true. It is my own oversight.

Mr. CRAMTON. Do I understand the gentleman to say that it has been submitted to the Budget?

Mr. LUCE. My recollection is to that effect.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. When a bill is passed over without prejudice, does it retain the same status on the calendar, or does it require three to object to it in order to put it off the calendar the next time it is called?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It retains its status on the calendar.

Mr. CRAMTON. In this case no objection has been made.

LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9036) to increase the salary of the Librarian of Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Librarian of Congress on and after July 1, 1928, shall receive salary at the rate of \$10,000 per annum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] on the splendid work that he has done and is still doing for the Library. I think it is worth special mention.

The bill that he had passed in Congress some time ago, which permits the Library to accept bequests, has brought some very valuable gifts to that institution. It has been worth a great deal to the people of the United States. I am glad to see that he recognizes the splendid service that is being given by the librarian. If there is any man here in Washington who deserves a salary of \$10,000 a year it is Mr. Herbert Putnam. As stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts, he has charge of 757 people. He has \$9,000,000 worth of real-estate property in his custody. He has 3,500,000 books under his control, besides about 7,000,000 manuscripts and periodicals. He and his force are most valuable adjuncts to any Mem-

ber of Congress. He is the one whose force looks up for you every item of research that your women's clubs send you, and everything that any of your constituents seek knowledge upon here in Washington. He is a valuable help to every Member of Congress.

While on my feet I want to say that he has one of the most efficient and well-qualified assistants—Mr. Frederick W. Ashley. And his executive assistant, Mr. Allen R. Boyd, is very efficient and accommodating. They are as valuable men as I ever saw in charge of a Government office. I wish it were so that the gentleman from Massachusetts had gone further and given these gentlemen a substantial increase in salary, because they deserve it. And both Mr. Hugh A. Morrison and Mr. George H. Milne deserve like raises. I hope before he stops his good work that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] will bring in a proper bill and give all of these men a salary commensurate with the splendid work that they all perform.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I indorse everything that the gentleman has said. If my information is correct, the young men and young ladies who are working over there receive the poorest salaries of any force in the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. They are the poorest paid employees in the Government.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. And yet the most valuable?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I hope as the gentleman stated that they may receive some consideration at the hands of this committee.

Mr. BLANTON. That was going to be my last comment on the subject. All of the employees there are the poorest paid in the Government. And they should have substantial raises. Many are working for salaries of \$1,200 to \$1,500 per year and have families to support.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman has said that Mr. Putnam has in his charge \$9,000,000 worth of property. That is merely the value of the real estate.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; of the real estate alone.

Mr. BURTON. But he has 3,500,000 books under his control.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, you can not estimate the value of the books and periodicals. I refer to the actual real estate value of the Library when I said \$9,000,000.

Mr. BURTON. I have been familiar with the Library for more than 30 years, and I approve everything that has been said in favor of increasing the salary of the librarian.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman from Ohio knows, of course, that there are books over there whose value you can not estimate. You can not estimate the value in money of these 3,500,000 volumes.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. What is the present salary of the librarian?

Mr. BLANTON. Seven thousand five hundred dollars a year.

Mr. DENISON. And this bill increases this to \$10,000?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. While we are increasing the salary of the librarian from \$7,500 to \$10,000 a year, why not increase the salaries of the employees who the gentleman says are so poorly paid? Why did not the bill consider them also?

Mr. BLANTON. I presume the gentleman from Massachusetts did not want to bite off more than he could properly masticate at this time. I believe we will yet bring in a bill that will do justice to the assistants and to the other employees in that institution.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It seems singular that we increase salaries from \$7,500 a year to \$10,000 a year but yet ignore the employees that the gentleman himself says are underpaid.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sure that they are underpaid, and I am sure that the gentleman from Massachusetts will tell you he realizes that and that he will soon bring in a bill to take care of them.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But the gentleman from Massachusetts does not tell us anything.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

I am in hearty accord with the bill to raise the salary of the efficient Librarian of Congress. I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts why he did not bring in a bill as has been suggested by several gentlemen here, to me privately, increasing the salaries of other efficient employees. For instance, there

is Mr. Morrison in the congressional reading room. You can not place a value upon his services to Congressmen who go there looking up data. I think he told me that he has been there for 45 years.

Mr. COLTON. And he has a very able assistant in Mr. Mills.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes; Mr. Milne, and also a splendid lady in the congressional reading room, very efficient and intelligent. I can not call her name at the present, but she is splendid; and he is getting the same salary that he got 25 years ago—I mean Mr. Morrison. If I am in error about that, the gentleman from Massachusetts will correct me. Why not bring a bill in here as suggested, which seems to be the sentiment of the House, increasing the salary of the faithful employees there, all through the Congressional Library, and especially the men like Mr. Morrison and Mr. Milne, and the handsome and intelligent lady with the Martha Washington hair?

You can go there, I will state to my friend, and ask Mr. Morrison, Mr. Milne, and the lady to get you any statement made by a Senator or Representative 30 or 40 years ago. It may only be a sentence, and yet they will get that for you in 10 minutes' time. People like that ought not to be paid to-day, considering the excessive cost of living, just what they were paid 25 years ago. I am in favor of raising the salaries of those in the Library who do the work in the Library. I was wondering why they could not get their compensation increased to a figure commensurate to their service. I was just asking a question.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Texas that all of these employees have been classified under the classification act, and they ought not to be raised outside of the general classification. Otherwise we would have to raise the salaries of all of the employees of the Government in Washington. They have already had their raise under the classification act.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It must be a very small raise, considering the small salaries many of these employees tell me they are getting.

Mr. BLANTON. Lots of Library employees are getting less than \$1,200 a year.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Well, that is a reflection upon this Government.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There are 65,000 employees of the Government. We do not want to get into trouble by raising one bunch without raising the rest.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Let us raise all the bunches if they are as poorly paid as the Library employees. We raised our own, I recall, about two years ago.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. LUCE. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] has explained the situation. These employees are under the classified schedule, and much as I would like to see the employees of the Library receive more pay, it would be bold, indeed, for me to urge an invasion of the classification scheme so recently put into effect, although my sympathies are wholly in harmony with the suggestion that the employees of the Library deserve a higher wage.

While I am on my feet I would express my appreciation of the generous words of the gentleman from Texas, not only those concerning myself but also and of more importance those concerning the Library and the librarian. Few privileges have I more valued than that of having share, however small, in the conduct of this great institution, which does so much credit to the country, and I am glad of every opportunity to advance its interests.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Are all the employees of the Library, except those the gentleman named, under the classified service?

Mr. LUCE. As I understand, the librarian himself is not exempted. A group of men who deserved more salary received consideration last year from the Board of Classification. The first step was to transfer these men from the second grade to the first grade, which specifies a salary of \$7,500, evidently contemplating that Congress could go above that amount if it so desired. It would have been an invasion of the classification system if they had attempted to take anybody from the second grade and give him an increase beyond the minimum of the first grade.

Now that the Classification Board has made the change, it becomes practicable for the first time to recognize the exceptional circumstances of Mr. Putnam's employment, the

long duration of his term of service, the efficiency of his work, and his value to the Nation; but, if I understand it rightly, he still remains nominally as classified in the first grade of the classification act.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think my colleague [Mr. DENISON] inadvertently referred to the civil service act. These employees are not under the civil service, as I understand.

Mr. LUCE. They are in the classified service.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts state whether or not these men, like Morrison and Milne and others, are now properly classified? They might be put in a class where they could not be given a raise even under the reclassification law. I am reliably informed this has been done by the Reclassification Board many times in other departments here.

Mr. LUCE. It seems to me that their service in the Library would warrant a higher classification than they have received.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is the librarian under the classified service?

Mr. LUCE. He is in the classified service.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What does that provide?

Mr. LUCE. The first grade specifies \$7,500, leaving any increase over that to the action of Congress. The second grade in the classified service ranges from \$6,000 to \$7,500.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is not the gentleman invading the classified service when he proposes to increase the salary of the librarian, just as much as if he were proposing the increase of salaries of these other men? Congress could increase the salaries of any of them, so far as that is concerned, regardless of the classified service.

Mr. LUCE. I could not have brought out clearly the fact that the framers of the classified system evidently intended that any increase over the figures appearing there—\$7,500—should be by the action of Congress. They hoped that the Congress would not interfere with the second and lower grades, but left it to us to act as we saw fit in the matter of the first grade.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not oppose the increase of salary. I think the present librarian ought to have an increase, but I think some of these other men ought either to be increased to a higher grade so that they could get an increase or Congress should grant them a favor. They grant us favors. They do everything they can possibly for us. If we can not increase the salary by act of Congress of those who are included in the classified service, then I would like to have these gentlemen raised in their grades of the classified service.

Mr. LUCE. While the gentlemen and I are in accord in this matter, in case action is to be taken our first step should be to go before the Classification Board and present our arguments, and if they were futile then we would be justified in coming on the floor of the House.

Mr. LINTHICUM. We would have to depend on the gentleman to do that because he knows more about it than we do.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me say to the gentleman that this matter comes up every year. It comes before our legislative subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, of which I have had the honor to be a member for a number of years. I think some of these men earn more money than they are getting, and we all appreciate their splendid service. Our subcommittee looks into it every year. But we realize that if we start to raise a few men here and there, you have got to think about the 60,000 or 75,000 other employees in this city.

We have delegated this matter to the Classification Board and they have gone over it in a systematic way and Congress should not tear up what they have done. If we start to doing that we will soon have to do the whole classification work all over again, and for that reason we have felt it ought to be left to some general reclassification or some systematic action by Congress rather than to arbitrarily pick up a few men here and there and raise them every year.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman will find that the librarian is in the classification service at \$7,500, and because you can do it you pick him out and increase his salary but do not increase the salaries of others.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I may say that we have raised the salaries of a few of the heads of other bureaus. We have taken them out of the classified service and given a number of them \$10,000. That is the excuse and the only excuse for picking out this one man at this time. But he is a splendid high-class man.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXPORTATION OF ARMS, MUNITIONS, OR IMPLEMENTS OF WAR TO
BELLIGERENT NATIONS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 183) to prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunitions, or implements of war to belligerent nations.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a declaration of national policy upon a tremendously important question. Whether the policy expressed in the resolution is right or wrong is in no sense at issue at this time, but the question which is involved is whether a bill of this sweeping and far-reaching character should have a place upon the Consent Calendar, with just a few dozen of us gathered here. I do not think it should, and with all deference to the author of the resolution, and I have no more admiration and esteem for any person in this House than I have for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], I feel obliged at this time to object, with the thought that it should come up when the House as a whole may consider it and pass upon it. Therefore I object to its present consideration.

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. HOOPER. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. I concede that this is a measure of far-reaching importance but it would be a most impressive manifestation of the interest of this House of Representatives in the cause of peace if this could be passed here without objection. For that reason I placed it on the Consent Calendar. If, however, the gentleman thinks it should have further discussion or that there may possibly be objection to it, I shall be compelled to acquiesce.

Mr. HOOPER. There will be ample opportunity for bringing it up in such a way as to have it considered by the whole House. The whole membership will be greatly interested in hearing it discussed by the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

OIL AND GAS PROSPECTING PERMITS AND LEASES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 479) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant certain oil and gas prospecting permits and leases.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, but not intending to object, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. WINTER] asked me if he were not here—and I do not see him here at this time—to ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MONUMENT IN COMMEMORATION OF WILLIAM RUFUS KING

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7903) to authorize the erection at Clinton, Sampson County, N. C., of a monument in commemoration of William Rufus King, former Vice President of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely difficult to object to anything that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY] might want, but this bill proposes an expenditure of public funds with which to build a monument in North Carolina to a gentleman of limited fame. He happened to have been Vice President in a very unimportant period of our history. I do not believe we can afford now to start in on a monument-building program generally around the country and therefore I am obliged to object.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. I withhold the objection.

Mr. LUCE. The Committee on the Library for several years has shared the views of the gentleman from Michigan and we have looked adversely on proposals to erect monuments, but we have thought that a comparatively small expenditure for markers commemorating the birthplaces of distinguished men was not a great burden on the Treasury; and where expended in places of comparatively small size, at a distance from populous centers, where there could be no considerable historical society to attend to the need, it was not inappropriate to provide for it from the Federal Treasury.

This is a case of commemorating the birthplace of one of the Vice Presidents of the United States with an expenditure

of \$2,500 for a marker. I trust the gentleman will not consider this so serious a matter as to require further consideration in the House.

Mr. CRAMTON. I may say, first, the appropriation goes beyond what might be called a marker, and if there were any real justification for it in the fame of the person honored, there would be a willingness to contribute that would be somewhat removed even from the place where it is to be erected.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman point out where it goes beyond the purpose I have designated? It was our intention by the amendments as printed to erect a tablet or marker.

Mr. CRAMTON. I judged by the sum involved that it went beyond the marker stage.

Mr. LUCE. These markers are usually boulders with a bronze plate on them, or else a cement structure, very simple, and, of course, at a cost of \$2,500 nothing very elaborate could be erected.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does this include the expenses of the celebration when the monument is unveiled?

Mr. LUCE. The Federal Government has rarely taken part in the dedication of markers. The matter is not of such consequence as to warrant that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think there are very few districts but what could think of someone who has lived in that district at some time who had rendered services somewhat commensurate with those to be celebrated by this so-called marker, and if we are to have \$2,500 markers scattered in every Member's district, it will run into money.

Mr. LUCE. We report, perhaps, four or five a year only.

Mr. CRAMTON. And in most cases, as the gentleman knows, "without cost to the Government."

Mr. LUCE. Not in the case of these markers. The gentleman is in error in that respect. The provision for markers so far as I know has always been made in precisely this way.

Mr. CRAMTON. I shall feel obliged to-day to object.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] withhold his objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. I withhold it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I want the gentleman to hear me a moment if he will. I agree in large measure with what the gentleman has said about putting up monuments or markers to inconsequential people, and I would say to the gentleman that if this was just an ordinary man whose birthplace I am undertaking to have marked, there would be merit in what the gentleman has said. However, I want to call the gentleman's attention to this man, William Rufus King, who was the Congressman from my district from 1810 until 1816. He then went to Alabama and was a member of the Constitutional Convention of Alabama. He was elected to the Senate from Alabama. He went to St. Petersburg, representing the American Government as a member of the American Embassy there. He came back to this country and was again elected to the Senate from Alabama. Then he was made minister to France. He came back and was again elected Senator from Alabama and elected president pro tempore of the Senate and then was nominated and elected Vice President, being on the ticket with Franklin Pierce. He died while he was Vice President of the United States. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that men like Edward Everett, Douglas, Benton, and Pierce, and Franklin Pierce the President all spoke of him as being one of the great men of the country.

I introduced a bill having for its purpose the erection of a monument to this man, but meeting the very idea that has been advanced by the gentleman from the Michigan, the chairman of the committee told me very frankly he would not recommend a monument but would recommend a marker or tablet.

We are furnishing the land down there and it does seem to me the gentleman should not object. I do not think the matter of \$2,500 will break the Government or be in conflict with the President's policy of economy. I hope the gentleman will forego his objection at this time and withdraw it and let this bill go through. It would be very pleasing to me if the gentleman would do so, and I hope he will. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. I appreciate, of course, the adverse circumstances prevailing here to-day—

Mr. ABERNETHY. Oh, no; I am not considering that at all.

Mr. CRAMTON. But I do not eat oysters, so I am not involved. I do not understand why \$2,500 is needed for a marker unless there is to be a joy ride and a celebration, an oyster roast, or something of that kind.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the language is not to exceed \$2,500.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, they always spend the full amount. I will say to the gentleman, yielding to the sentiment that grows

out of the hospitality of the gentleman, that if the gentleman would accept an amendment providing \$1,000, they could then put in a marker as big as the circumstances justify.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Split the difference and make it \$1,500.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I will accept the \$1,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; it is too late now.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE PRESS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech made by Judge CHARLES H. BRAND, Congressman from the eighth district of Georgia, in regard to H. R. 7912, which deals with foreign language press. This speech was made over the Fellowship Forum Radio Station, WFFF, on Friday evening, February 3.

There was no objection.

The speech, with the prefatory statement of the editor of the Fellowship Forum thereon, is as follows:

Declaring that the foreign-language newspapers published in America constitute a national peril and an uninterrupted menace to our form of government, Congressman CHARLES H. BRAND, of Georgia, proceeded to explain the dangers and set up the remedy for them, in an eloquent address over the Fellowship Forum Radio Station, WFFF, on Friday evening, February 3. Mr. BRAND has a bill now before Congress to curb the publishing of literature in other than the English language in this country, and is an authority on this important subject. His address follows:

"The bill which I have been invited to discuss, which was introduced in the House of Representatives by me on December 19, 1927, proposes: 'To exclude from the mails certain newspapers containing matter printed in foreign language.' The bill provides:

"That any newspaper containing matter, printed in a foreign language, advising, advocating, or teaching opposition to all organized government; the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or of any State of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof; the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either of specific individuals or of officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any State of the United States or any political subdivision thereof, or the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property, is hereby declared to be nonmailable; except that any copy of such newspaper containing a true and complete English translation of the text of all such matter contained therein shall not be excluded from the mails as nonmailable matter under the provisions of this act.

"The second provision of the bill makes it a criminal offense if an attempt is made to distribute foreign-language newspapers through the mails without an English translation thereof.

"Such legislation as this is a matter of grave importance, particularly for the following reasons:

"Because in 1921 there were 916, and in 1927 there were 1,231, foreign-language newspapers printed and circulated in 38 States of this country, and in some of the territories and insular possessions of the United States. In addition to this, there are foreign-language newspapers printed in 47 different countries of the Old World which are mailed here and circulated in this country.

"Because of the present trouble and the policy of the present administration in regard to Nicaragua, Mexico, and China, all of which countries for over 12 months have been in strife, turmoil, and at times in actual war.

"Because of the infirmities of the present immigration law, and the failure and inability on the part of the Government to effectively enforce the same.

"Because of the constant friction and animosity and the greed and jealousy existing among European countries.

"Because of the unfriendly attitude on the part of practically all the nations of the world toward the United States.

AMERICA FOR AMERICANS

"However, there is another and more powerful reason for the necessity of this legislation in which the people of the United States, over and above all other things, are interested and that is preserving America for Americans, and holding in perpetuity our form of government and preserving inviolate American ideals and American institutions. It is the duty of the American Congress, and of the editors of the English press of the United States, and of the rank and file of the native-born Americans, and of all foreign citizens who are loyal to our country and its traditions, to let the world know that we will not tolerate and that there is no place in this country for any foreign-language newspaper or any foreign-language newspaper editors if they print and circulate treasonable publications such as covered in the proposed bill.

"According to figures compiled in 1924 by the Manufacturers' Record from the census of 1921, there was a total of 916 daily and weekly newspapers and periodicals printed in foreign languages in this country and having an aggregate circulation per issue of 9,896,371.

"There were 146 daily newspapers published in foreign languages having an aggregate daily circulation of 2,418,823; 400 weekly newspapers

and periodicals published in foreign languages with an aggregate circulation per issue of 3,489,648; and 370 publications in foreign languages other than daily, Sunday, or weekly with an aggregate circulation per issue of 3,987,900.

IN 30 LANGUAGES

"These foreign-language publications include about 30 of the principal languages represented among the foreign population of the United States.

"With the exception of the readers of these foreign-language publications, the public knows nothing about the doctrines these papers are preaching and whether they are patriotic or unpatriotic, American or bolshevistic, in their teachings.

"American citizens who are inclined to ignore the menace of radical and subversive propaganda in the United States should remember that our country faces a problem found in no other country. We have not only the pink and red radicals among our native stock but we have 14,000,000 aliens and 24,000,000 persons of foreign parentage who are subjected to pernicious anti-American propaganda.

"In New York City, the headquarters of the socialist-communist forces in this country, there are printed 34 foreign-language daily newspapers with an estimated daily circulation of 947,000, which exceeds the combined daily circulation of the New York Times, Herald-Tribune, and American by 79,000.

DANGEROUS TO AMERICA

"According to a publication entitled 'Better America Federation of California,' a magazine printed in Los Angeles, there is an average of 275 papers printed in foreign languages in other countries and circulated in the United States that are openly preaching the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

"It also says that editors and publishers of the foreign-language newspapers in America may contend that they are not engaged in activities subversive to our form of government and we are not so charging all of them, but we are pointing out that in a country where the common language is English, the circulation of so many papers in other languages is dangerous to Americanism. As long as millions of peoples of foreign birth or descent in America get information on American affairs through the eye of those of their own nationality, such persons can not become truly Americanized.

"There are circulated in the United States newspapers, magazines, and periodicals printed in foreign languages from the following countries of the world: Argentine Republic, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, British Guiana, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Colony, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Denmark, Egypt, France, Germany, England, Scotland, Wales, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Korea, Mesopotamia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, San Salvador, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela.

"I have received, since the introduction of the present bill, letters from private citizens, American newspapers, periodicals, and magazines from nine different States indorsing the bill. There have been dissenters from two sources only, one from the Jewish Tribune published in New York, and the other from A. Joseph Di Silvestro, owner and editor of the La Libera Parola, of New York.

"In the issue of The Fellowship Forum of April 20, 1927, there appeared an article written by A. Di Domenica, who is the pastor of an Italian Baptist church in Philadelphia, in which he asserted that the Italian press, printed in foreign language, circulating in this country had, with a few exceptions, conducted a campaign in this country detrimental to America, and for this reason he strongly advocated the passage of this legislation as being imperative for the welfare of America.

IMPUDENT AND INDECENT

"This man Silvestro replied to the editorial in his paper in a very ugly, impudent, and un-American manner, his editorial containing severe criticisms of the Italians of this country whose conduct and lives were loyal to America. The Italian Baptist preacher also stated that the Silvestro editorial contained many vile things which were so indecent they could not be published in English.

"I want to say here and now, and without any suggestion from any person to do so, that there is no newspaper printed in the United States which is more loyal to America, the American Government, the American people, and American institutions than The Fellowship Forum.

"The Manufacturers' Record not only has taken notice of this perilous situation in its editorial columns in 1924 but is still in favor of this character of legislation. Its latest editorial utterance upon the subject appears in yesterday's issue, entitled 'Treasonable publications should be suppressed,' which is as follows:

"Somewhat on the line of the editorial, 'Be on guard,' which appeared on the cover page of the Manufacturers' Record, December 15, Representative C. H. BRAND, of the eighth district of Georgia, introduced a bill in Congress to exclude from the mails certain newspapers containing matter printed in foreign languages.

"Not only should this bill be enacted into law, but also that law should be enforced to the very limit. Opposition may be expected not only from the lawless element of the country—the anarchists, soviets, communists, and other reds—but also, in some measure, from so-called

"liberals," among both the people and the press, particularly the demagogues in both those circles. Such opposition makes enactment and enforcement only the more imperative.

"The length to which such published instigations to communistic insurrection now go, unchecked by the Federal or local authorities, is an actual menace to the Republic—in no other civilized country would such preachments be permitted. It is not at all improbable that such publications could be suppressed right now by proper enforcement of existing laws; but whether or not such be the case the fact remains that sedition is openly preached and urged by foreign language, and some English language papers in the United States at this moment.

"Mr. BRAND has done a patriotic service in the introduction of this measure, and it is to be hoped that the interest of Congress will not cease with its enactment, but will compel the responsible executive departments to protect the Nation and its Government more effectually than is done at present."

"Let me say in conclusion that the present immigration law declares that persons who believe in and do any of the things inhibited by this bill shall be excluded from admission into the United States, and yet there is no existing law preventing these foreign-language newspapers, published in all portions of the earth, from being sent here and circulated in this country, whether the papers are friendly or unfriendly to America, and without 1 in 10,000, outside of their subscribers, knowing what they are advising and teaching.

NATIONAL PERIL

"This sort of situation involves the destiny of this Republic. It is a national peril and constitutes an uninterrupted menace to our form of government. The influence of these foreign-language papers reaches the islands of the seas and covers the inland possessions of the United States.

"Their influence, like the waves of the ocean, is ever moving and active, and flourishes in the blackness of night as well as in the sunlight of day.

"Silently, ceaselessly, and to some extent secretly and with unknown and unmeasured effect it does its work with uncurbed and relentless power. Such a situation is intolerable, and it is the imperative duty of Congress to remedy this evil."

ADDRESS OF HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish], at the Lincoln Club of St. Paul, on February 13 last.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY KEEPS FAITH WITH LINCOLN

Fellow Republicans of the Lincoln Club of St. Paul, it is a great pleasure and privilege to come here from out of the East to do honor and pay tribute to Abraham Lincoln, the supremest character on the crowded canvas of the nineteenth century and the greatest Republican of all time.

At the outset of my remarks I want to congratulate the people of St. Paul for sending MELVIN MAAS, an ex-service man, to Congress. All things being equal, I believe that the voters should give preference to those who served in the armed forces of the United States during the World War, and particularly to those who risked their lives in the Air Service. It is my good fortune to serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs with Mr. MAAS, and I can truthfully say that he has shown, for a new Member, not only a high degree of intelligence but sound common sense and good judgment on the questions that have come before us. Moreover, during my service of seven years on the committee, he is, I believe, the first newly elected Member to be appointed to that committee. His knowledge of airplanes and their development has been exceedingly useful to both the committee and to the Congress. He has already made good in his first term.

I do not know whether the people of St. Paul appreciate the fact, but there have been more appointments to high Federal positions of prominent citizens of St. Paul than in New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia combined. To begin with, there is the distinguished Secretary of State, Frank B. Kellogg. Of course, I understand that appointment, as he was born in New York State. Then there is a galaxy of able public servants—Justice Pierce Butler, of the United States Supreme Court; Solicitor General William Mitchell; Robert Olds, Undersecretary of State; and Carl Schuneman, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. It is a political mystery in Washington how one city could secure so many important public offices, but all I can say to you is that appointments of men of such high caliber, regardless of party affiliations, is a service to the Republican Party that made them and a service to the people of this great Republic.

It is highly fitting that each year on the anniversary of his birth that Republican clubs all over this land should expound the life, career, and achievements of this immortal American who helped to found our

party and with its aid preserved the Union and freed the slaves. Each year adds new laurels and renown to the name of Abraham Lincoln until to-day this humble, patient, kindly President personifies the spirit of our Republican form of government and what is best in the life and ideals of our country. The name of Lincoln signifies to every American schoolboy that the humblest in origin and wealth can rise to the heights of earthly power and renown through his own efforts.

Lincoln belongs to the country and to the world as one of its greatest characters, but we should not forget the indisputable fact that he was part and parcel of the Republican Party and the foremost expounder of its principles and doctrines. The early history of the Republican Party is synonymous with the political career of Abraham Lincoln. He received over a hundred votes for Vice President in 1856 when Fremont was nominated as President. As a Republican candidate he contested the senatorial election with Douglas, and although he lost, he added to the strength and growing prestige of the Republican Party by his inexorable logic in the celebrated joint debates with the "Little Giant." From 1860, when he was elected as the first Republican President, to 1865 when he was killed, Lincoln was the undisputed leader of the party as he is the soul of the Republican Party to-day.

My distinguished colleague, Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, the dean of the Minnesota delegation in Congress, has eloquently depicted to you one of the outstanding traits in Lincoln's character—that of simplicity, but there should be added to that these supplemental virtues, so strong in Lincoln, of honesty and truth. This triumvirate of virtues backed by natural intelligence and an indomitable will made success inevitable.

There was no more luck in Lincoln's political career than there was in the trans-Atlantic flight of Lindbergh, the adopted son of Minnesota. Both were prepared through the hard school of experience; both knew everything there was to know, even to the smallest details of their profession; and when obstacles suddenly confronted them they were able to steer the ship of state in one instance, and the airplane in the other, into a safe harbor where others less prepared would have failed. Lincoln and Lindbergh! What noble names for future Americans to conjure with and to inspire oncoming generations to do and dare. One the greatest character of the nineteenth century and the other the outstanding character so far of the twentieth century. Both pioneers from out of the West with the same dauntless courage and will to succeed. There is another remarkable comparison between these two great characters which I will state without attempting to draw a moral: Neither Lincoln nor Lindbergh ever smoked or took a drink. How many men do we know in good health who never smoked or drank?

I am informed that when Lincoln called for his first 75,000 volunteers the Governor of Minnesota was then in Washington and made the first offer to raise a regiment of infantry. It is certain that when further appeals for troops were made that Minnesota, the infant State of the Union at that time, sent more than her quota. From every village, hamlet, and town poured forth the pioneer blood of Minnesota to the famous tune of "We are coming, father Abraham, 300,000 strong from Mississippi's winding stream and from New England's shore."

The gallantry of the First Minnesota on the second day of Gettysburg is unsurpassed in our history. There should have been an American Tennyson to depict the heroic and forlorn charge when General Sickles was driven out of the peach orchard and his troops, almost surrounded, were striving to gain the Union lines on Cemetery Ridge; the First Minnesota was thrown against the flank of the onrushing and triumphant Confederates and saved the day by their heroic sacrifice, only 40 of the regiment coming out of the battle unwounded.

I am mindful of the fact that former Senator Knute Nelson, of Norwegian descent, served with the same loyalty in the Union forces as he did later in the Senate of the United States for many years. We in New York are still proud that a famous Swedish inventor, John Ericsson, made his home there and became one of our foremost citizens. When the war came, he, too, was prepared; he had already made many important inventions, improved steam engines, fire engines, and propellers for ships; but his greatest contribution was the ironclad *Monitor*, which defeated the *Merrimack*, saved the Union fleet, and revolutionized naval warfare. We Americans can never fully pay our debt of gratitude to that adopted son whose invention was an important factor in saving the Union. Lincoln himself was one of the first to realize the value of invention, and later to give Ericsson unstinted praise. Every man or woman of Swedish origin in America should read about the romantic life of Ericsson and feel pride in his contribution to the Union victory and the cause of Abraham Lincoln.

The freemen of the North, including the Scandinavians and Germans, were practically a unit for the Union and opposed to extension of the slave system. It was the Germans under Franz Sigel, of St. Louis, that saved Missouri for the Union, and we in the North should never forget their loyalty to their adopted flag when sedition was rife among native-born Americans and disunion facing the Government.

It is now almost a decade since the signing of the armistice that ended the World War. Is it not time that the passions and prejudices engendered in that conflict should be put definitely behind us? Is it not time that the spirit of hatred and hostility should cease and that all nations should strive together for international peace and good will?

The statute of limitations has long since run against enmity toward the German people. Our Government should welcome and befriend the German Republic which under wise leadership is becoming a potent force for international limitation of armament and world peace.

It is naturally true that many people of German ancestry in this country opposed our entrance into the World War; but once war was declared they were just as loyal as any other element of our population. The two outstanding American aces, Eddie Rickenbacker and Frank Luke, were of German origin, the parents of the former having been born in Switzerland and the latter in Germany.

Americans of German origin are among our most industrious and loyal citizens and have done much to build up our country. The greatness and prosperity of many of the western cities—Chicago, St. Louis, Milwaukee, and St. Paul—is due in a large measure to the German population for their thrift and honest industry. Americans of German descent wherever found are forces for good citizenship and a bulwark against bolshevism and communism.

I favor the immediate return of the property seized in this country from German citizens during the war. Retention of such property amounts to confiscation and is a violation of the traditional policies of the United States from Alexander Hamilton to the present time. I am also in favor of placing a definite time limit on the payment of German reparations under the Dawes plan.

The war-debt settlements with England, France, and Italy on the basis of carefully considered capacity to pay are not only fair but exceedingly generous. The Italian debt settlement represents a reduction of 75 per cent of the war debt, and the French settlement which has not yet been agreed to by the French Government amounts to a 52 per cent reduction. There has never been a more liberal or generous settlement among nations. We do not claim we won the war, but we must not forget that American troops helped turn the tide from defeat to victory; yet we asked for nothing and got just what we asked for—nothing at all—no conquered lands, no territories, no indemnities or reparations except to pay for our army of occupation. There is no possible excuse for calling us "Uncle Shylock." We spent thirty-five billions and loaned ten billions more; yet, when we seek a partial payment, we meet with reproach from our former allies. All I want to say is that the position of the Government of the United States is fair, just, and represents unparalleled generosity in the recorded dealings between nations.

The State of Minnesota should indeed be proud that one of her adopted sons is America's ambassador of international good will, who brings about cordial and friendly relations between us and other nations where diplomats have failed. And another of her adopted sons is the Hon. Frank B. Kellogg, the Secretary of State, born in New York State, and now a leading citizen of St. Paul, who is taking a prominent part in framing a treaty to outlaw war and doing away as far as is humanly possible with man's inhumanity to man.

The text for my speech calls for an answer to the question, Has the Republican Party kept faith with Lincoln, and in order to answer it properly, let me read you the platform of Abraham Lincoln when he first ran for member of the Illinois Legislature:

"Friends and fellow citizens, I am plain Abe Lincoln. I have consented to become a candidate for the legislature. My political principles are like the old woman's dance—short and sweet. I believe in a United States bank. I believe in a protective tariff. I believe in a system of internal improvements, and I am for freedom of every human creature. If, on that platform, you can give me your suffrage, I shall be much obliged. If not, no harm done, and I remain, respectfully yours, Abe Lincoln."

This appeal was written when Lincoln was a Whig, long before the birth of the Republican Party, but it shows his consistency of principles. The national bank act was passed in 1863 under Lincoln's administration and has always been upheld by the Republican Party together with a resumption of specie payment, sound money, safety in finances, and economy in governmental expenditures.

Lincoln inaugurated and carried the most drastic measures for the protection of American industries ever conceived of up to his time. The Republican Party is not for a hidebound tariff or a Chinese wall. Its position is to afford a living protection as between the difference in the cost of production abroad and in the United States.

The Democratic Party has recently again proclaimed its faith in a revision of the tariff downward, and has evidently put it forward as one of the main campaign issues for 1928: The prosperity of our country has been built upon the protective principle which has made possible the American standard of wages and of living. Our wage earners are the best paid, best housed, best clothed, and most contented in the world. Revise the tariff downward and permit competition from the underpaid labor of Europe or the Far East and the economic supremacy of the United States will crumble and the disastrous days of 1914 will be revived with its soup kitchens and millions of unemployed. Revision of the tariff downward would not merely mean depression of wages but a general business chaos. Instead of revising the tariff downward I believe that the time has come when agricultural products should be given the same amount of protection as other industries. The farmers of both the East and the West

have to buy in a protective market and sell in competition with the rest of the world.

The remedy is not in a downward revision of the tariff but in affording adequate protection on what farmers produce. They are entitled to the same consideration as any other protected industries—no more or no less. I see no sound reason why various farm products which are suffering from foreign competition, such as dairy products, eggs, vegetables, poultry, etc., should not be afforded adequate protection. It seems to me to be fair and just that the rates on agricultural products should be on a level comparable to the rates that are effective in other industries. I would be glad to vote for any practical, constructive farm-relief measure that would help the farmer to help himself and establish agriculture on an economic parity with other American industries.

Lincoln was an advocate of the land-grant colleges and signed the Morrill bill in 1863, and was outspoken in favor of both educational and internal improvements.

The Republican Party has always stood for internal improvements, and I am hopeful that the Federal Government will bear the financial burden in solving the problem of flood control on the Mississippi River, which drains half the States of the Union. It is not a local but a national issue.

The last of the five points in Lincoln's original platform for the assembly—freedom of every human creature—was settled after the expenditure of much blood and treasure in a terrible civil war and was written into the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution. Lincoln repeatedly said that he had derived all his political sentiments from the Declaration of Independence. It was Lincoln, the emancipator, who by a stroke of his pen made effective that essential principle of the Declaration of Independence which reads: "All men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; namely, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." He found the colored men and women chattels and he left them human souls. All men are created equal was no mere rhetoric to our first Republican President but a living, breathing, vibrant fact which must be safeguarded. Lincoln was the representative of the spirit of our democratic institutions and of that principle of equality of opportunity and of equal rights under the laws and the Constitution.

Born in a log cabin with only one room, a dirt floor, and no windows or doors, where summer rains and winter snows made life uncomfortable. He grew up amidst hardships helping his father to clear the forests or hiring out to neighbors. Until he studied law he never had six months of teaching all told. Abraham Lincoln was the embodiment and incarnation of the plain people. He knew and understood the thoughts and needs of the American people. He once said, "God must have loved the plain people because he made so many of them." One thing is sure, that Lincoln had faith in and loved the plain people, and they in turn had faith in and loved him. The Republican Party for 70 years or more has stood for equal opportunities to rich and poor, and agreed with Lincoln that no man should be discriminated against on account of race, creed, or color. There is not a principle in the Republican Party to-day that is out of harmony with or inconsistent with the teachings and character of Abraham Lincoln. The Republican Party could well afford when in doubt to go back to the people and learn from them. There you will always find abundant common sense and patriotism.

The people of America are weary of extremes; they have no use for the agitator or demagogue, and on the other hand they see through selfish interests, foreign or domestic, that would despoil the Government and undermine the confidence of the people in our free institutions. The common sense of the plain people, who in peace create the wealth and in war carry the muskets of the Republic, is an infallible guide. It was the source of Abraham Lincoln's wisdom.

It must be almost inconceivable to you virile Americans of the West, but even at this moment successful business men, heads of great industrial organizations, bankers, and intellectuals are returning from short visits to Italy, where they met Mussolini and come home extolling and praising that temporary dictatorship and belittling and minimizing our own form of government. Mussolini may have saved Italy from the horrors of communism. Fascism may be the kind of government needed in Italy, but it is scarcely any different from the dictatorship of Julius Caesar 2,000 years ago. It is the negation and denial of our republican form of government. It is a repudiation of government by the consent of the governed and all popular government. It is the rule by force and the bayonet and the denial of all civil liberties, the right to vote, the liberty of the press, the freedom of speech, and of assembly.

Mussolini says our democratic form of government has been a failure. Wherein has it failed? Thanks to Abraham Lincoln and the Republican Party, we are a united and prosperous country of over one hundred millions of contented people who are free and equal and whose civil rights are guaranteed by the Constitution. In spite of Mussolini and fascism in Italy and Stalin and communism in Russia denying popular government, the spirit of Abraham Lincoln is marching on. When he first spoke those immortal lines at Gettysburg, "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from

the earth," there were only a few republics in the world. To-day there are only a few remaining monarchies, and they have yielded to popular government. The picture of Abraham Lincoln may be found by the traveler in the humblest abode in Japan or in the farthest outskirts of China, and underneath the words: "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people." It is the dream and the hope of the oppressed and the struggling masses the world over, and Lincoln is the incarnation of that sentiment.

Our friendly enemies, the Democrats, recently at their Jackson Day dinner vied with each other in denouncing, abusing, and vilifying the Republican Party as responsible for graft and corruption in the Federal Government. I take this opportunity to deny the charge as absurd and false and challenge them to specify a single act of graft or corruption under the Coolidge administration. Every thinking American knows that President Coolidge stands on the mountain tops for rugged honesty and incorruptibility, and that no man guilty of dishonesty or wrongdoing, whether he be Republican or Democrat, can hope for any favor or protection from the present administration. I deplore these wild charges and raising of hobgoblins of graft where none exists, because they undermine the faith of the American people in their form of government. On the other hand, I deplore the personal attacks made by Republicans upon Gov. Alfred E. Smith, who with the exception of waste and extravagance in his administration—saving at the spigot and letting out at the bung-hole—has made a good record as Governor of New York State. Governor Smith, if nominated for the Presidency by the Democrats, will be beaten, but not through personal attacks or abuse, but by selling to the public the glorious record and achievements of the Republican Party for peace, progress, and prosperity ever since the days of Lincoln.

We must not forget that the Republican Party was originally composed of many different elements—Whigs, Union Democrats, Free Soilers, and Abolitionists. To-day we are the strongest national party and there is ample room for varying opinions arising on such controversial questions as prohibition, farm relief, or taxation. The Republican Party is big enough and broad enough to hold within its ranks every American who believes in the principles and doctrines enunciated by Abraham Lincoln. I trust I am not transgressing the bounds of political ethics when I say that I hope the great State of Minnesota will soon again take its proper place as a banner Republican stronghold by sending another Republican Senator to Washington to uphold the ideals and the party of Lincoln.

Let us unite for the common good, with charity for all and malice toward none. Let us welcome back the prodigal sons within our ranks. There rests upon all Republicans in this presidential year of 1928 a solemn duty to dedicate a portion of his or her time, talents, and energy to upholding Republican principles and electing Republican candidates. I have an abiding confidence in the future of the Republican Party. I have an abiding faith in the judgment and patriotism of the American people. They may be temporarily led astray by false leaders, but they will always return to true principles and belief in party responsibility. Let us highly resolve that Lincoln shall not have died in vain. His work is not finished, and it will not be finished until his conception of popular government and the rights of the people shall be accepted by every civilized country. Ours is the only national party of service, of constructive legislation, of sound money, of a protective tariff, of a square deal and a full dinner pail for labor, and of practical economy and wise statesmanship.

The Republican Party had its birth in the great West, and took its first three presidential candidates, Fremont, Lincoln, and Grant, from Western States. What could be fairer or more appropriate if the choice should again fall on a Republican of the West to lead our national ticket, like Lincoln and Grant, to overwhelming victory? We look upon a house no longer divided and upon a united and prosperous country which is only in the morning of its glorious destiny. Let us give thanks on this anniversary that we are American citizens and belong to the party that has kept faith with Abraham Lincoln. Let us rededicate ourselves to the proposition that a government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth, because it is the fairest, safest, soundest, most honorable, and best government devised by the mind of man.

AMENDING THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10166) to amend the Foreign Service buildings act, 1926.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Reserving the right to object, I think this bill is one of considerable importance. I understand the Committee on Foreign Service is to have an early Calendar Wednesday, and I prefer that it should go over until that time.

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. The bill is twofold. Under the Foreign Service buildings act the commission has authority to purchase

sites and construct buildings, but it has no power to exchange properties. We are confronted with this situation: In Yokohama we own a site. The building was destroyed by the earthquake. It is situated adjacent to buildings owned by the Japanese Government, and they are anxious to secure it. They have offered us a site twice as large and much better located for our purposes for the one which we now own. We have the plans prepared for the building and are anxious to ask for bids. This amendment increases powers of the commission so that it can exchange property as well as purchase it.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. If the bill went no further than to authorize this particular exchange I would have no objection to it, but it is much broader than that, it authorizes the general authority to exchange, and I think to sell—

Mr. PORTER. No; not to sell. The reason that it gives general authority is because of the situation in Habana, Cuba. There we will probably have to exchange because the present embassy has turned out to be unsuitable.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I confess I have not had time to study the bill very carefully, but it has another objectionable feature, and that is that while the expenditure mentioned in the bill is not large it authorizes that the expenditure shall be without regard to the civil service or without regard to the reclassification act. I think that is a mistake and is unnecessary. For the present I shall have to object to the bill.

SALE OF LAND IN PHILADELPHIA TO THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD CO.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5476) to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. a tract of land situated in the city of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. ROMJUE. Reserving the right to object, I want to inquire something about the value of this property. Inasmuch as the bill sets out that this property is to be sold to a specific company, what information has the committee as to the amount of money they can get?

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the gentleman that they will pay the regular price. This has the recommendation of the Secretary of War and has been gone into in detail. It is satisfactory to everybody and is absolutely necessary, because the road wants to make changes in its tracks.

Mr. ROMJUE. The bill says it is to be sold to this specific company. Inasmuch as you sell it to this company, the committee ought to make inquiry as to the amount of money they are going to receive. Can the gentleman tell us the amount that the purchasing company are willing to pay for it?

Mr. HUGHES. I can not; but it has been gone into and is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I can give the gentleman some information about the bill. The bill provides that before the sale is made an appraisal shall be had under the direction of the Secretary of War and that the railroad company shall pay the cost of the appraisal and that the sale price shall not be less than the appraised value of the property.

Mr. ROMJUE. I do not see any particular merit—

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I am not interested in the passage of the bill. I am bringing to the attention of the gentleman the fact that there is a safeguard in the bill.

Mr. ROMJUE. And that means that the railroad company will appraise it and then buy it?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. No; the Secretary of War would cause an appraisal to be made under his direction.

Mr. ROMJUE. The bill does not say who shall appraise it?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. No; but it is to be done under the direction of the Secretary of War. He would select the appraisers.

Mr. ROMJUE. It seems to me the committee should make some inquiry as to the value of the property before selling it.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I am not a member of the committee, or urging the passage of the bill. There is that safeguard in the bill, and it provides, as I have said, that it shall be appraised under the direction of the Secretary of War and the price paid shall not be less than the appraised value of the property.

Mr. ROMJUE. The gentleman from Texas usually makes a very careful investigation of matters, and I would like to know whether the bill meets with his approval?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I have no objection to the bill with the safeguard. I am not criticizing the gentleman from Missouri, because he is within his rights in objecting to the bill, if he does object to it.

Mr. DENISON. It is the custom of the Secretary of War to appoint competent men to make appraisals of property.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this bill received very careful investigation by the committee, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN] put these safeguards in the bill. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN] is unable to be present this afternoon, as he is attending a hearing before the committee on Muscle Shoals.

Mr. ROMJUE. Does the gentleman know whether or not any member of the committee made any effort to find out the actual cash value of this property which is sought to be sold?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Oh, yes. The subcommittee did, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN] had this amendment put in. It has to be appraised, as millions and millions of dollars worth have been appraised heretofore, under the direction of the War Department. They have appraisers that they appoint themselves, disinterested people.

Mr. ROMJUE. And the gentleman from Texas is satisfied?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I have no objection to this being reported, and I have no objection to its being passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to sell, upon such terms and conditions as he considers advisable, to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., or its nominee, a tract of land containing 1.5512 acres, more or less, said tract now forming a part of War Department reservation at Twenty-first Street and Oregon Avenue, being the westerly end of the reservation, situate in the city of Philadelphia and State of Pennsylvania, which said tract is no longer needed for military purposes, and to execute and deliver in the name of the United States and in its behalf, with and to the said the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., or its nominee, any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments necessary to effectuate such sale; the proceeds of the sale of the property hereinbefore designated to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the fund known as the military posts construction fund.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, after the word "fund" insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of War shall have the said tract appraised at the expense of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.: And provided further, That the Secretary of War shall not sell said tract for a less consideration than the appraised value hereinbefore referred to."

The committee amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

NEZ PERCES INDIANS

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, some time ago unanimous consent was given to pass over Calendar No. 228 (H. R. 8110), withdrawing from entry the northwest quarter section 12, township 30 north, range 19 east, Montana meridian. I ask that we now return to that and take up the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the northwest quarter section 12, township 30 north, range 19 east, Montana meridian, is hereby withdrawn from all forms of entry under the public land laws of the United States, for the purpose of preserving the site of the battle between Nez Perces Indians under Chief Joseph and the command of Nelson A. Miles.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 8, page 1, after the word "Miles," add the words "and the area is hereby created a national monument."

Page 2, add a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with the State of Montana, or Blaine County, Mont., or citizens of Montana, or either or any of them, for the care and upkeep of the herein-described lands."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the department has no objection to the bill as introduced, but it does object to the amendment creating a national monument. Would it be agreeable to the gentleman from Montana to have that amendment disagreed to?

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, the bill was introduced by myself without that amendment. The amendment was put on by the committee. It is entirely agreeable to me to have the committee amendment disagreed to, because I know that it could be made a national park by presidential direction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The committee amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is now on the second committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENABLING MOTHERS OF DECEASED SOLDIERS TO VISIT EUROPE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5494) to enable the mothers and unmarried widows of deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized, in cooperation with the American National Red Cross, to arrange for pilgrimages to cemeteries in Europe wherein are interred the remains of persons in the military or naval forces of the United States who died during the World War. Such pilgrimages may be made at the expense of the United States under the following conditions:

First. Invitations to make such pilgrimages shall be extended in the name of the United States to the mothers and unmarried widows of the deceased.

Second. Invitations shall be for only one pilgrimage by each mother or unmarried widow.

Third. Such pilgrimage shall be made at any time during the period of three years from July 1, 1928, to June 30, 1931, inclusive.

Fourth. Pilgrimages shall be made in groups numbering approximately 500 each.

Fifth. Each group shall be permitted to remain in Europe for approximately two weeks, but in no case longer than three weeks, unless return transportation shall be unavailable in the meantime.

Sixth. The Government owned or chartered vessels shall be used for transportation at sea.

Seventh. First-class accommodations shall be furnished each mother or unmarried widow and to such Red Cross attendants as may be selected to accompany any pilgrimage for the entire distance traveled at sea or on land and while sojourning in Europe or awaiting transportation in the United States.

Eighth. The Interstate Commerce Commission shall grant permission to railroads and other carriers of passengers for hire under its jurisdiction to furnish transportation free or at reduced rates to each mother or unmarried widow and to such Red Cross attendants as may be selected to accompany any pilgrimage.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum as may be necessary to defray all expenses of the pilgrimage, as authorized by regulations approved by the President.

SEC. 3. The money herein authorized to be appropriated shall be disbursed by such disbursing officer or officers of the Army as may be designated by the Secretary of War. All disbursements shall be audited by the Secretary of War, whose certificate that any such disbursement is authorized by the act and/or by the regulations of the President shall be final and conclusive on the General Accounting Office and shall entitle the officer making the disbursement to credit therefor in his accounts without further evidence or vouchers.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War shall certify to the General Accounting Office, for debiting on the proper account, any charge against any disbursing officer for any loss or deficiency arising in his accounts under this act. Said certificate shall set forth that it includes all changes made up to its date and not previously certified and that the officer has had a reasonable opportunity to be heard and has not been relieved of responsibility. The effect of such certificate when received shall be the same as if the facts therein set forth had been ascertained by the General Accounting Office in accounting.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike out:

Fourth. Pilgrimages shall be made in groups numbering approximately 500 each: and insert:

"Fourth. (a) For the purpose of such pilgrimages passports shall be issued by the Department of State to such mothers, unmarried

widows, and Red Cross attendants as may be selected to accompany such pilgrimage, who are citizens of the United States, and travel documents to those who are aliens, without fee for either document.

"(b) Such alien mothers, unmarried widows, and Red Cross attendants shall be permitted to return and be granted admission to the United States without regard to any law, convention, or treaty relating to the immigration or exclusion of aliens."

Page 3, line 23, after the word "war," insert "under such regulations as may be prescribed by the President of the United States."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask some one in respect to the committee amendments. The committee amendments provide that while these gold-star mothers shall go over, they shall go over in groups. I assume that that will not destroy the real purpose of the original bill, which is to provide a trip at Government expense for the mothers whose sons sleep in France, so that they may visit the cemeteries where loved ones lie buried. I think this is a meritorious measure, and I hope that it will pass the House without any objection. I have had opportunity to visit the battle fields of France and the cemeteries there. I know that these gold-star mothers ought to have the opportunity of paying a pilgrimage to where their loved ones sleep, and that they will be glad to embrace an opportunity which a grateful Government and a grateful people shall extend to them through this agency.

The committee amendments were agreed to; and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SURVEY OF BATTLE FIELDS—TRAVELING EXPENSES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 235) to authorize the payment of travel expenses from appropriations for investigations and surveys of battle fields.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That mileage of officers of the Army and actual expenses of civilian employees traveling on duty in connection with the studies, surveys, and field investigations of battle fields shall be paid from the appropriations made from time to time to meet the expenses for these purposes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WIND RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 356) to amend section 2 of the act of March 3, 1905, entitled "An act to ratify and amend an agreement with the Indians residing on the Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation, in the State of Wyoming, and to make appropriations to carry the same into effect."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of chapter 1452 of the Statutes of the Fifty-eighth Congress (33 Stat. L. 1021), being "An act to ratify and amend an agreement with the Indians on the Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation, in the State of Wyoming, and to make appropriations to carry the same into effect," as amended by Joint Resolution No. 12 of the Fifty-ninth Congress (34 Stat. 825) and chapter 197 of the Statutes of the Sixtieth Congress (35 Stat. L. 650), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the time for making entry and payment for mineral lands located under the act of March 3, 1905, shall be extended for the period of 10 years from July 1, 1927, and any right, title, or interest in any such mineral lands acquired heretofore under the provisions of the said act of March 3, 1905; and the mineral land and mining laws and regulations of the United States, and not perfected by entry and payment, but subsisting in full force and effect in so far as compliance with the requirements of the said mineral land and mining laws and regulations are concerned, shall, notwithstanding the fact that five years may have elapsed since the location of any claim, continue in full force and effect, without any diminution whatsoever of the right, title, or interest on account of failure to make entry and payment within five years from the date of the location of such claim: *Provided*, That the extension of time hereby granted shall not apply to mineral lands of

coal, oil, and gas: *And provided further*, That this act shall not be construed as reviving any placer mineral location which has lost its validity because of failure to comply with the Federal and State laws."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MENOMINEE RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 176) granting consent of Congress to an agreement or compact entered into between the State of Wisconsin and the State of Michigan for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a highway bridge across the Menominee River.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, given to the States of Wisconsin and Michigan to enter into the agreement or compact executed by the State highway commissioner of the State of Wisconsin and the Highway Commission of the State of Michigan pursuant to authority of chapter 87 of the Wisconsin statutes, and the authority of act 354 of the public acts of 1925 and special act 98 of the public acts of 1927 of the State of Michigan, and each and every part and article thereof be, and the same is hereby, ratified, approved, and confirmed: *Provided*, That nothing therein contained shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the United States in and over the region which forms the subject of said agreement; which agreement is in words and figures as follows:

AGREEMENT—MENOMINEE-MARINETTE BRIDGE AT BRIDGE STREET RELOCATION WISCONSIN HIGHWAY COMMISSION WITH MICHIGAN STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSIONER

This agreement, executed this 14th day of January, 1927, by and between Frank F. Rogers, State highway commissioner of the State of Michigan, with offices at Lansing Mich., party of the first part; and the Wisconsin Highway Commission, with offices at Madison, Wis., party of the second part:

Witnesseth that:

Whereas the existing interstate bridge, crossing the Menominee River at Bridge Street and joining the municipalities of Marinette, Wis., and Menominee, Mich., is in an unsafe condition and requires early reconstruction; and

Whereas a proper plan for reconstruction involves a relocation and includes a grade separation and expensive approach fills and properly extends as a project from the center of Dunlap Square in the city of Marinette to the center line of Ogden Avenue in the city of Menominee; and

Whereas the State boundary line, as determined by the United States Supreme Court in a late decision, lies entirely north of the proposed actual structure spanning the Menominee River, and thereby complicates the respective responsibilities of the two parties hereto both as regards construction and maintenance obligations.

Now, therefore, it is hereby agreed:

1. That this project shall, subject to changes to be hereafter mutually agreed upon as signified by joint approval of all subsequent plans and estimates, be built in accord with the preliminary plans prepared by the first party and marked "Exhibit A" and approved by the second party and hereto attached and considered as an integral part of this agreement, and that the detailed plans and specifications for the project shall be prepared by the first party subject to the approval of the second party.

2. That each party shall either directly or through the respective cities, townships, and counties within which the work is situated, furnish and bear the full cost of all right of way and abutting and property damages arising from or necessary to the execution of the plans as they may be finally, mutually, and jointly approved by the said parties, as applying to property situated on the side of the existing interstate boundary line subject to the jurisdiction of the respective parties hereto or the respective cities, townships, and counties within the respective States.

3. That aside from the stipulations stated in item 2 above, the entire cost of fully executing the project shall be borne equally by the respective parties hereto, and that to this end any contribution or assessment, to be hereafter paid by the Chicago & North Western Railway Co. and/or by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. and/or by any other public utility company affected by the project, shall be credited equally to the shares of the parties hereto, and, further, that any contribution or assessment which may be arranged by either party to be paid by a county, township, or municipality within the respective States shall be guaranteed by the respective parties hereto, and that all payments and transactions in the handling of the construction of this project shall be directly between the parties hereto, each of whom

agrees to act as its own collecting agent in dealing with the other contributing parties in their respective States.

4. All contracts shall be let jointly by the first and second parties hereto, who shall jointly constitute the first party to all such contracts and no contracts shall be let until after formal approval of awards by each party. The work of construction shall be administered under the joint supervision of the first and second parties as first party of all of the aforesaid contracts to be let under the terms of this agreement, but the second party hereto agrees that its inspection and supervision shall be administered through the representatives of the first party and not through direct dealings with the contractors, and that any matters of dispute in regard to the administration of the contracts shall be adjusted jointly by the bridge engineers of the respective parties hereto. Each party may retain such engineering assistance in supervising the work as it may deem necessary and the cost of such engineering, including office work and administration as may become necessary, shall be considered a legitimate charge to the project. Estimates to the contractor shall be paid direct by each party hereto, each in the amount of 50 per cent of the total estimated amounts due under the provisions of the specifications of the first party and as approved by the second party, all estimates being prepared by the first party at two week intervals or thereabouts, approved by the first party and submitted to the second party for approval, the second party making payment direct to the contractor on approval of estimates and the first party likewise making payment to the contractor on receipt of copies of the estimates after being approved by the second party. Authorizations for extra work will be handled in the same manner as the original contracts. The engineering costs on this project will be considered as including expenditures made by each party prior to the date of the execution of this agreement as well as all such costs subsequent thereto.

5. The work to be covered by this agreement is further indicated in an approximate preliminary estimate of cost known as Exhibit B, based on Exhibit A, attached herewith and considered as an integral part of this agreement. This estimate is for preliminary budget purposes, it being agreed that the shares of the respective parties shall be based upon the actual cost of the work.

6. For the purpose of future maintenance it is hereby agreed that the first and second parties shall, upon completion of this project, each maintain that portion of the project (or bear the expense of doing so) which lies north and south respectively of the center of the third span measured from the north end of the river structure.

7. That the first and second parties shall, through their respective United States Senators and Congressmen from the districts within which the project is situated, take the necessary steps to secure the approval of the United States Congress at the 1928 session, authorizing the construction of said project, and also the necessary approval of the United States War Department.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have on the day first above written caused this agreement to be executed by their proper authorities.

FOR THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,
By FRANK F. ROGERS.
FOR THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
By WISCONSIN HIGHWAY COMMISSION.
(Signed) C. R. WEYMOUTH.

[SEAL]

Approved as to form,

LINCOLN E. BRADY.

Approved December 1, 1927.

(Signed) C. A. MELICK.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "and each and every part and article thereof be, and the same is hereby, ratified, approved, and confirmed."

Page 8, line 6, after the word "Rogers," add "State highway commissioner"; and on line 10, after the word "Weymouth," add "secretary"; and on line 14, after the word "Bradt," add "legal adviser"; and on line 17, after the word "Melick," add "bridge engineer, Michigan State highway department."

Line 19 add:

"Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this resolution is hereby expressly reserved."

The committee amendments were agreed to; and the joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

PUYALLUP INDIAN CEMETERY, TACOMA, WASH.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 173) to provide funds for the upkeep of the Puyallup Indian Cemetery at Tacoma, Wash.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to set aside on the books of his office under an appropriate designation the sum of \$25,000 from the tribal funds of the Puyallup Indians accruing under the act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. L. 633), as a permanent trust fund at 4 per cent interest, to be credited semiannually and used only for the upkeep of the Puyallup Indian Cemetery in the city of Tacoma, Wash., under the direction of and in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, who is hereby authorized to withdraw said interest from the Treasury of the United States for this purpose.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, after the word "Interior," strike out the remainder of lines 2, 3, and 4 and insert in lieu thereof the words "upon appropriation."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

WISCONSIN POTTAWATOMIE INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7207) to appropriate treaty funds due the Wisconsin Pottawatomie Indians.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. I move to consider in lieu of the House bill the Senate bill, S. 1759. It is identical except that it reads "authorize to appropriate" instead of "appropriate."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to substitute S. 1759 for the House bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$6,839, being the unappropriated balance of the total amount of \$447,339 due the Wisconsin Pottawatomie Indians of Wisconsin and Michigan under the treaty of September 27, 1833 (7 Stat. L. 442), and the act of June 25, 1864 (13 Stat. L. 172), as set out in House Document No. 830, Sixtieth Congress, first session: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of \$37,044.55 in the appropriations made for said Indians by the acts of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 156), May 25, 1918 (40 Stat. L. 589), and June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. L. 29), and which have reverted to the Treasury, are hereby reappropriated; and that said sums, together with the unexpended balance of \$4,347.73 in the appropriation for the purchase of land for said Indians made by the act of June 30, 1913 (38 Stat. L. 102), shall be subject to expenditures for their benefit or payment to them, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. LEAVITT. I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Montana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEAVITT: Page 1, line 3, after the word "hereby," insert the words "authorized to be."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after the word "hereby," insert "authorized to be," and in line 11 strike out the word "expenditures" and insert in lieu thereof the word "expenditure," and amend the title.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the House bill H. R. 7207 will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

HOSPITAL AT FORT BIDWELL INDIAN SCHOOL, CALIFORNIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8542) to provide for the construction of a hospital at the Fort Bidwell Indian School, California.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I wish the gentleman would withhold his objection and allow the bill to be passed over without prejudice. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice, and also the following bill, Calendar No. 273, namely, the bill H. R. 8543.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bills be named be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT], I want it understood that my objection was withdrawn.

CERTAIN LANDS IN CALIFORNIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8898) to provide for restoration to the public domain of certain lands in the State of California which are now reserved for Indian allotment purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the public lands in townships 4 and 5 south, range 31 east, and townships 4, 5, and 6 south, range 32 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, temporarily reserved from settlement, entry, sale, or other disposition by Executive order of May 9, 1912, for allotment to Paiute and other Indians, be, and they are hereby, restored to the public domain subject to the provisions of Public Resolution No. 29, approved February 14, 1920 (41 Stat. 434), as amended by Public Resolutions Nos. 36 and 79, approved January 21 and December 28, 1922 (42 Stat. 358, 1067), respectively, on dates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

WITHDRAWAL OF LANDS IN INYO COUNTY, CALIF.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9037) to provide for the permanent withdrawal of certain lands in Inyo County, Calif., for Indian use.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described lands in California be, and they are hereby, withdrawn from entry, sale, or other disposition and set aside for the Indians of Indian Ranch, Inyo County, Calif.: *Provided,* That the withdrawal hereby authorized shall be subject to any prior valid right of any persons to the lands described: Township 21 south, range 44 east, northwest quarter section 3 (surveyed), northwest quarter northeast quarter section 3 (unsurveyed); township 20 south, range 44 east, southeast quarter section 33 (unsurveyed); northwest quarter and northwest quarter southwest quarter section 34 (unsurveyed); of the Mount Diablo meridian in California, containing 560 acres, more or less.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

GOLD-STAR MOTHERS

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. O'CONNELL] may be permitted to extend his remarks on the bill, H. R. 5494, known as the gold star mothers' bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNELL] be permitted to extend his remarks on the bill indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, in speaking and pleading for the passage of this bill, H. R. 5494, I find myself engaged in a work that has consistently occupied my attention for the past seven years. I rejoice with the Members of the House who I am sure are unanimously prepared to vote for its adoption; that the Committee on Military Affairs so promptly reported in its favor, thus placing it on the high road to easy passage. The evidence presented before the committee by Mrs. Burling, of the Gold Star Mothers' Association, by Mrs. NORTON, our distinguished colleague of New Jersey, as also by the other Members of the House so impressed the committee that it took the unusual methods of making a favorable report forthwith.

Our colleague, Mr. BUTLER, is to be commended for the energy he has shown in advocating the bill.

We should all rejoice that it will be our good fortune as Members of this body to have helped to pass this bill that will permit these glorious women to visit the sanctified resting places of their heroic dead in the cemeteries of the countries they redeemed and reclaimed by the supreme sacrifice upon the altar of devotion. The invasion of Europe by these splendid mothers shall be one of peace, concord, and good will, which will go far to cement our friendship with the allied nations across the sea with whom our boys fought the fight of victory. Let me quote the great plea made by Mrs. Mathilda A. Burling, national representative of the Gold Star Mothers' Association of America, Richmond Hill, N. Y., at the hearings before the committee:

At the outset I desire to express my great appreciation to Congressman BUTLER, of Pennsylvania, not only for his kindness in introducing this bill but for the spirited and generous manner in which he has pressed it for consideration. Also on behalf of my associates I desire to thank your chairman for his courtesy in affording us this hearing and to thank as well Congressman O'CONNELL and Congressman BOYLAN, of New York, for their help and cooperation.

You no doubt realize how anxious the gold-star mothers are to visit their sons' graves. Have you gentlemen stopped to think and consider what America would have done if it had not been for these mothers? Not alone the gold-star mothers, but the mothers who gave their sons to serve their country. It was the mothers who suffered to bring these boys into the world, who cared for them in sickness and health, and it was our flesh and blood that enriched the foreign soil.

Can you picture the anxiety of these mothers watching at the door for the postman every day for the little letter that was to come from her boy, and the agony and suspense when those letters stopped, and then only to be replaced with a telegram from Washington informing her that her boy was wounded or missing or dead?

Many of these boys were just in the bloom of life, just going into manhood. Some of these mothers lost one, some two, and some three, and some four.

I would like to take my case for example. On February 13 it will be the tenth anniversary of the death of my boy. He was my only child. To me he was only a child, only 17 years old when he went across. He was killed at the time when to me life was sweetest, only to have been turned to sorrow at the receipt of the dreadful telegram announcing his death.

There were many nurses who were with the boys when they died. They had informed mothers that the boys' lips were sealed with the words "Mother, my mother." Oh, what a death, to be calling for his mother!

Can a Government ever repay us for our loss? The cost of this pilgrimage would be very little for the Government to do for us. It would only be fitting to send us across this year, this being the tenth anniversary of our great sacrifice, and I am sure it would not be asking too much. May we not include the mothers of the unknown dead on this trip? There are so few. The Government has done such good work in identifying the bodies. I believe there are only about 300 left. What a comfort it would be to let these mothers kneel at one of the

graves marked with a marble cross with the words "Here lies an honored American soldier known but to God," and be comforted, thinking it might be her boy!

Gentlemen, think of those dear, sweet mothers now on in years. This might be granting their last wish. Many have died with a broken heart. Can those who remain not be given this comfort of going over? Does it not seem a shame that the mothers have to beg for that privilege which should have been offered them?

I, personally, do not believe there will be 30,000 mothers who will want to go. What a wonderful peace mission it would be if such a group of mothers could be sent abroad as is proposed in the bill. I believe it would bring the countries closer together than any act that could ever be suggested. This, I am sure, will be the wish of every gold-star mother. These women, the mothers of those dead, I am sure, are pleased at the idea proposed in the bill to have the arrangements under the auspices of the Red Cross. There is no doubt that the passage of this bill will have the support of the press and the public of the United States and the world in recognition of the sacrifices we have made for our country and the world.

And I would like to bring to the attention of the House the following splendid plea made to the committee in a letter to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN], from the distinguished junior Senator from my State [Mr. WAGNER], which brings the subject home to all our hearts:

Hon. JOHN J. BOYLAN,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Some time ago I had occasion to express myself in reference to the proposal which is now embodied in S. 2681 and H. R. 5494.

I am sending you a copy of my statement:

"During the negotiations for the settlement of the various war loans we largely overlooked a great debt, long past-due and payable to our own kin. It is a debt of honor. We owe it to the widows and orphaned mothers whose loved ones lie in the war cemeteries of Europe to afford them the meager solace of a visit to these holy graves. These wearers of the gold star have been deprived of the assistance, companionship, and love of their sons and husbands. The national emergency required it. But no cause is served when we further deprive them of the consolation of paying their last tribute. Legislation should forthwith be framed for the conveyance of every war-bereaved mother and widow to the grave side of him who carried her love across the sea and sacrificed it for the safety of our Nation.

"The expense of transporting approximately 30,000 persons is comparatively trifling. Had the brave boys who lie in France, Belgium, and England survived the Great War, the Government would have brought them back home to their wives and mothers. Let not this Nation profit through the supreme sacrifice of its heroes. Such a holy pilgrimage to the American shrines in Europe would be a great living and moving monument to peace. The ranks of mothers and sweethearts would constitute a new expeditionary force and first line of defense for peace.

"Europe would see us in a new light, not as fighting doughboys, nor as gallant legionnaires, but as a nation of homes and families whose members are capable of the most pious sentiments.

"The transports of war must be turned into transports of consolation for those whom victory or reparation could never compensate. The soil of Verdun and Flanders now treasures their love; it should act promptly to give effect to this proposal, and I will do everything in my power to bring it about."

Yours very truly,

ROBERT F. WAGNER.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will pass, it must pass, because it is just, because it is human. Its passage will have the approval and the applause of the American people and the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

ANNUAL CONVENTION OF UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7908) to authorize the granting of leave to ex-service men and women to attend the annual convention of the United Spanish War Veterans and Auxiliary in Habana, Cuba, in 1928.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman from Michigan withhold his objection until I suggest an amendment which I would like to offer if the bill is permitted to be considered?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The bill is exactly like the bill which was passed for the ex-service men, but the intention of this bill is to allow this privilege of attending the convention only to the veterans of the Spanish-American War. Therefore if the bill is considered I expect to offer an amendment to strike out the words "to ex-service men and women" and insert "to veterans of the Spanish-American War." There is no reason why this

privilege should be extended to any but those people and that limits the scope of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill is one to which it is difficult to object, as the gentleman knows. On the other hand, I have not been able to see any reason for it. The gentleman urges the meeting of the Legion in Paris as a precedent. Of course, this is a meeting of Spanish-American War veterans in Cuba. There is that similarity, but it lacks, however, the same travel requirements. This came from the gentleman's committee. Let me ask the gentleman: Does he contemplate or is it his theory that this precedent should ever obtain for any meeting held in this country?

Mr. LEHLBACH. No; nor do I conceive of any event in the immediate future that would give any justification for the following of any precedent that might possibly be deemed established by this bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. If meetings in this country are not to be held to benefit by this precedent, of course, there is not much danger in the future, because there will not be many meetings outside of the country. The undesirable feature of it is that while none of them will probably take over a month in attending this meeting, including the trip to Panama, they will, however, have two months' leave, and it is disorganizing to any organization or any business to have employees away for two months at a time. Furthermore, it allows them to take their leave in advance; but in view of the gentleman's statement restricting it to veterans of the Spanish-American War and his statement restricting such action to meetings abroad, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the heads of the executive departments and independent establishments of the Government and the municipal government of the District of Columbia be, and they hereby are, authorized to grant, in their discretion, extended leave not to exceed 60 days in the calendar year 1928 to ex-service men and women for the sole purpose of attending the annual convention of the United Spanish War Veterans and auxiliaries in Habana, Cuba: *Provided, however,* That this statute shall not be construed to modify the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1893, the act approved May 23, 1908, and the act approved February 28, 1925, limiting the annual leave which may be granted with pay to 15 or 30 days in any one year, except that any portion of the 15 or 30 days' leave not granted or used during the calendar year 1927, or the fiscal year 1928, may be allowed to accumulate and be pyramided for the purpose herein specified in addition to the 15 or 30 days' leave with pay in the calendar year 1928 or the fiscal year 1929.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "ex-service men and women" and insert in lieu thereof the words "veterans of the Spanish-American War."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the title of the bill by striking out the words "ex-service men and women" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "veterans of the Spanish-American War."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PENSIONS FOR COMMISSIONED UNITED STATES DEPUTY MARSHALS FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5709) granting a pension to the regularly commissioned United States deputy marshals of the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, including the Indian Territory, now the State of Oklahoma, and to their widows and dependent children.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. HOOPER, and Mr. TILSON objected.

PUBLIC PRINTER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6669), fixing the salary of the Public Printer and the Deputy Public Printer.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania tell me something about this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time, I object.

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Texas to withhold his objection in order that I may make a very brief statement.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object for this reason: There are over 100 bureaus here the chiefs of which, by the classification act, get salaries of \$7,500 a year. If you increase the salary of this bureau chief, you set a precedent for other bureau chiefs coming in here and demanding similar increases. It is in the protection of the Treasury, which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has to look after, that I object.

TRANSPORTATION OF MAILS BY AIR TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND INSULAR POSSESSIONS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7213), to grant authority to the Postmaster General to enter into contracts for the transportation of mails by air to foreign countries and insular possessions of the United States for periods of not more than 10 years, and to pay for such service from the appropriation for the transportation of foreign mails at fixed rates per pound or per mile, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] if he has the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that several members of the committee, including the gentleman, had a talk with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. MADDEN] with reference to the provision that the award, interpretation, and administration of the contract are entirely within the jurisdiction of the Postmaster General, the President, and the courts. We agreed to amend that provision by striking out the words "and administration," as suggested by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and I have an amendment for that purpose.

Mr. MADDEN. With the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] that he has remedied the difficulty which I thought existed, I would not object.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think this matter should come up on a regular legislative day. It is a matter of much importance and I shall object.

Mr. KELLY. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes; I do not think we should consider legislation of this particular character under unanimous consent.

Mr. KELLY. If the gentleman will withhold his objection a moment—

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes; I will certainly allow the gentleman to make any statement he cares to make about it.

Mr. KELLY. This is a very important measure, I admit. Time is the essence of the matter. The purpose is to give the Postmaster General authority to contract for the carrying of foreign mail by air at certain fixed rates per pound. It happens that in Central and South America companies financed by European capital are being organized at the present time and are asking concessions of those governments. The United States Government at the present time can secure permission to carry this mail, if it acts within a reasonable time; but if it delays too long we will lose the opportunity.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Does the gentleman mean we lose the opportunity to secure contractors?

Mr. KELLY. I mean if we allow this matter to go for any considerable time, foreign companies will have concessions from South and Central American countries and it will embarrass us seriously.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. There is a good deal of effort being made by German aviation companies to get the right to control the aviation business between the United States and South American Republics. They wanted the right to cross the Panama Canal and a number of other things which, of course, would be very serious if they were allowed to have them. The Postmaster General and everybody connected with the service have appealed for early consideration of this problem and for a final disposition of it at an early date in order that they may be able to meet the demands on the part of the South American Republics,

who are anxious to deal with the United States rather than with any other country.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Let me say in reply, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], I shall not press my objection, but I do reiterate that legislation of this kind and of this importance really ought not to be taken up on Consent Calendar day, but I am not going to press my objection. There seems to be a good reason why we should make an exception in this particular case.

Mr. MADDEN. That, I think, would be true under ordinary circumstances.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw by objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when, in his judgment, the public interest will be promoted thereby, the Postmaster General is authorized to enter into contracts for the transportation of mails by air to foreign countries and insular possessions of the United States for periods of not more than 10 years, and to pay for such service from the appropriation for the transportation of foreign mails at fixed rates per pound or per mile; and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to award such contracts to the bidders that he shall find to be the lowest responsible bidders that can satisfactorily perform the service required to the best advantage of the Government: *Provided*, That the rate to be paid for such service shall not in any case exceed \$2 per mile: *And provided further*, That in the award, interpretation, and administration of the contracts herein authorized, the decision of the Postmaster General shall be final and not subject to review by any officer or tribunal of the United States, except by the President and the Federal courts.

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General shall make and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "service," strike out the following: "from the appropriation for the transportation of foreign mails," so that it shall read "pay for such service from the appropriation for the transportation of foreign mails at fixed rates per pound or per mile."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY: On page 2, line 1, after the word "service," strike out the words "from the appropriation for the transportation of foreign mails."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment. In line 9, after the word "award," insert the word "and"; and after the word "interpretation" strike out the words "and administration."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY: Page 2, line 9, after the word "award," insert the word "and"; and after the word "interpretation" strike out the words "and administration," so that it will read: "*And provided further*, That in the award and interpretation of the contracts herein authorized."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSIONS FOR COMMISSIONED UNITED STATES DEPUTY MARSHALS FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5709) may be passed over without prejudice and retain its place on the calendar.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know its status after it remains on the calendar, there having been three objections. I shall not object, but I am wondering what would be the status of the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. It will be in the same status it is now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think the request is in order because the objections have stricken the bill from the calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am asking unanimous consent that it be passed over and that it remain on the calendar just as it is at present.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the only way in which this could be done would be for the gentlemen who objected to temporarily withdraw their objections. It seems to me that

this is the way to restore the bill to its former status on the calendar.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will ask the gentleman if he did not state when he made the third objection, after the Speaker hesitated a long while to find out whether there were three objections, "for the time being, I object."

Mr. TILSON. Let me say to the gentleman, frankly, that I came into the Chamber just at the moment the bill was being reported by the Clerk and was not acquainted with its contents. Two gentlemen who have studied the bill objected to its consideration, and I thought that at least a third person ought to study the bill. For this reason I objected temporarily until I could study the bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is what I understood.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, no request has been made of me to withdraw my objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. I did not get an opportunity to ask the gentleman, but I did ask the other two gentlemen who objected.

Mr. CRAMTON. The only question I have in mind is what would be the result if the gentleman from Oklahoma did keep the bill on the calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS. It would be on the calendar and would be subject to be stricken off upon three objections.

Mr. CRAMTON. As the Speaker has ruled, it would not be anything but an ornament to the calendar without a withdrawal of the objections, I am willing for the present to withdraw my objection if the other gentlemen do.

Mr. TILSON. With the understanding that it go over?

Mr. HASTINGS. Oh, certainly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the bill may be restored to the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5709) may be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for two minutes on the bill H. R. 6669.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC PRINTER

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of Members to the bill (H. R. 6669) objected to a few minutes ago. This is a bill from the Committee on Printing, and was also favorably reported to the House during the Sixty-ninth Congress. The committee is unanimous in its report and feels that this measure deserves favorable consideration. I realize that objection was made to its consideration to-day, but it will come up later for consideration. I merely want to call your attention to the bill, so that you can examine the report which the committee has made. For nearly 16 years I have served as a member of the Joint Committee on Printing. That is the longest service any Member of the House has had. I am, therefore, familiar with the excellent work that is being done by the Public Printer. The Government Printing Office employs over 4,000 men and women and transacts a business of \$12,000,000 annually. The salary of the Public Printer is not commensurate with his responsibilities. A private establishment employing anything like that number of men and women and doing that amount of business would probably pay its manager \$20,000 to \$30,000 a year. During the last three or four years we have raised the pay of all the men and women in the Government Printing Office. Employees who were receiving 50 and 55 cents per hour when I came here are now paid \$1, \$1.10, and \$1.15 per hour. The only officials whose salaries have not been raised are the Public Printer and the Deputy Public Printer. The Director of the Budget has twice recommended and approved an increase from \$7,500 to \$10,000. To-day the pay of the Librarian of Congress has been raised from \$7,500 to \$10,000, and the Public Printer is also deserving of a similar increase.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

SCOTT FIELD, ILL.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10146) to authorize appropriations for construction at Scott Field, Ill., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to that bill, and I assume the gentleman will not

object to it. This is one of the bills coming from the Committee on Military Affairs which seems to me to be unnecessary legislation on a Consent Calendar. It authorizes an appropriation where there is already authority of law. But if the gentleman will strike out the words "as in the judgment of the Secretary of War it may be necessary," I will not object. I think something should be left to the Committee on Appropriations to pass on.

Mr. IRWIN. There was an appropriation of \$100,000, but they say they can not put up a standard building with that amount of money.

Mr. CRAMTON. Was there a limit of cost, or was it simply an appropriation?

Mr. IRWIN. It was an authorization for \$100,000, and it is under construction, but the War Department says it will take \$30,000 more, and therefore they are not able to go on until they have this authorization.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will consent to strike out this blanket authority to the Secretary of War, I will be glad to consent.

Mr. IRWIN. I will agree to that.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$32,000, to be expended for the completion of barracks at Scott Field, Ill., including such utilities and appurtenances thereto as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be necessary.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "such," and on page 1, line 6, after the word "thereto," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS AT DAYTON, OHIO

Mr. ROY FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we return to H. R. 132, authorizing the erection of a sanitary fireproof hospital at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Dayton, Ohio, which was passed over temporarily.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, this is a bill where the gentleman from Ohio has had considerable difficulty between the conflicting authority of committees. When it was up last time I urged that there should be a report from the Director of the Budget either one way or the other. It seems that although the gentleman has been diligent he has not been able to get such report, but has only been able to get a telephone statement of the attitude of the Budget.

By reason of the peculiar circumstances of this case, I shall not object to it to-day, but I say this: Members who are seeking large appropriations in the future ought not to expect to get them by unanimous consent, unless there is before the House a report from the Budget, either favorable or adverse, so that the House may know there has been a checking up upon the matter by the proper authorities. As I say, by reason of the peculiar circumstances of this matter, I shall not object to this particular bill.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if there is no report from the Director of the Budget I think we may as well have one. I think we ought to have one on a large bill of this kind. Therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. This bill requires three objections.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other objections? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be erected at the Central Branch of said home at Dayton, Ohio, on land now owned by the United States, a sanitary fireproof hospital of a capacity for 500 beds. Such hospital shall include all the necessary buildings with the appropriate mechanical equipment, including roads and trackage facilities leading thereto, for the accommodation of patients, and storage, laundry, and necessary furniture equipment, and accessories, as may be approved by the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

SEC. 2. That in addition to the persons now by law entitled to the privileges of treatment in this hospital when constructed there shall

be admitted and treated honorably discharged nurses (female) who have served with the armed forces of the United States in any war and who are disabled by disease or wounds and by reason of such disability are either temporarily or permanently incapacitated from earning a living.

SEC. 3. That in carrying the foregoing authorization into effect the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the construction of the plant, or to purchase materials in the open market or otherwise, and to employ laborers and mechanics for the construction of the plant complete at a limit of cost not to exceed \$1,500,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 10487) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 10487, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivisions (b) and (c) of section 302 of the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended, are amended, to take effect as of December 31, 1927, to read as follows:

"(b) Such application shall be made and filed on or before January 2, 1930, (1) personally by the veteran, or (2) in case physical or mental incapacity prevents the making or filing of a personal application, then by such representative of the veteran and in such manner as may be by regulations prescribed. An application made by a person other than the representative authorized by any such regulation, or not filed on or before January 2, 1930, shall be held void. If the veteran dies after the application is made and before it is filed it may be filed by any person: *Provided, however,* That if the veteran died between May 19, 1924, and July 1, 1924, without making the application, leaving a widow surviving him, the application may be made by the widow and shall be valid with the same force and effect in every respect as if the application had been made by the veteran.

"(c) If the veteran dies after the application is made, it shall be valid if the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, finds that it bears the bona fide signature of the applicant, discloses an intention to claim the benefits of this act on behalf of the veteran, and is filed on or before January 2, 1930, whether or not the veteran is alive at the time it is filed. If the veteran dies and payments are made to his dependents under Title VI, and thereafter a valid application is filed under this section, then if the adjusted service credit of the veteran is more than \$50, payment shall be made in accordance with Title V, less any amounts already paid under Title VI."

SEC. 2. Section 602 of the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended, is amended, to take effect as of December 31, 1927, to read as follows:

"SEC. 602. (a) No payment under section 601 shall be made to a widow if she has remarried before making application, or if at the time of the death of the veteran was living apart from him by reason of her own willful act; nor unless dependent at the time of the death of the veteran or at any time thereafter and before January 3, 1930. The widow shall be presumed to have been dependent at the time of the death of the veteran upon a showing of the marital cohabitation.

"(b) Payment under section 601 shall be made to a child if (1) under 18 years of age at the time of the death of the veteran, or (2) at any time thereafter and before January 3, 1930, incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect.

"(c) No payment under section 601 shall be made to a mother or father unless dependent at the time of the death of the veteran or at any time thereafter and before January 3, 1930. If at the time of the death of the veteran or at any time thereafter and before January 3, 1930, the mother is unmarried or over 60 years of age, or the father is over 60 years of age, such mother or father, respectively, shall be presumed to be dependent."

SEC. 3. Subdivisions (b) and (c) of section 604 of such act, as amended, are amended, to take effect as of December 31, 1927, to read as follows:

"(b) Applications for such benefits, whether vested or contingent, shall be made and filed by the dependents of the veteran on or before January 2, 1930; except that in the case of the death of the veteran during the six months immediately preceding such date the application shall be made and filed at any time within six months after the death of the veteran. Payments under this title shall be made only to dependents who have made and filed application in accordance with the provisions of this subdivision.

"(c) An application shall be made and filed (1) personally by the dependent if 16 years of age or over, or (2) in case physical or mental

incapacity or legal disability prevents the making or filing of a personal application, then by such representative of the dependent and in such manner as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall jointly by regulation prescribe. An application made or filed by a person other than the representative authorized by such regulation shall be held void."

SEC. 4. Title III of such act, as amended, is amended, to take effect as of May 19, 1924, by adding at the end thereof new sections to read as follows:

"SEC. 311. Where the records of the War Department or the Navy Department show that an application, disclosing an intention to claim the benefits of any provision of this act, has been filed on or before January 2, 1930, and the application can not be found, such application shall be presumed, in the absence of affirmative evidence to the contrary, to have been valid when originally filed. In such case the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, shall not be required to transmit to the director the application (as provided in sections 303 and 605) unless a new application is filed, in which case the new application shall be considered to have been filed on the date of filing of the lost application.

"SEC. 312. (a) If satisfactory evidence is produced establishing the fact of the continued and unexplained absence of any individual from his home and family for a period of seven years, during which period no intelligence of his existence has been received, the death of such individual as of the date of the expiration of such period shall, for the purposes of this act, be considered as sufficiently proved.

"(b) If in the case of any such individual who is a veteran it appears that his application was not made and filed prior to the beginning of such seven-year period, or that although entitled to receive adjusted service pay he did not receive it prior to the beginning of such seven-year period, then his dependents who have made and filed application before the date of the expiration of such seven-year period (if such period began before January 3, 1930) shall be entitled to receive the amount of his adjusted service credit in accordance with the provisions of Title VI.

"(c) For the purposes of subdivision (b) of this section—

"(1) The widow shall be considered to be dependent, within the meaning of section 602, if she was dependent at the beginning of such seven-year period or at any time thereafter and before the expiration of such period. The widow shall be presumed to have been dependent at the beginning of such seven-year period upon a showing of the marital cohabitation.

"(2) A child shall be considered incapable of self-support, within the meaning of section 602, if incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect at the beginning of such seven-year period or at any time thereafter and before the expiration of such period.

"(3) The mother or father shall be considered to be dependent, within the meaning of section 602, if dependent at the beginning of such seven-year period or at any time thereafter and before the expiration of such period. If at the expiration of such seven-year period the mother is unmarried or over 60 years of age, or the father is over 60 years of age, such mother or father, respectively, shall be presumed to be dependent.

"(d) In the case of a veteran, if it appears that he is still living, payments to dependents in respect of his death shall cease, and, if he has filed a valid application under the provisions of section 302, any payments already made shall be deducted from the face value of his adjusted service certificate, or from the amount of his adjusted service credit if such credit is not more than \$50. In the case of a dependent, if it appears that such dependent is still living, payments to dependents later in preference under this act shall cease, and, if such dependent has filed a valid application under the provisions of section 604, the remainder of the payments shall be made in accordance with the provisions of Title VI.

"SEC. 313. That where any payment under this act is to be made to a minor, other than a person in the military or naval forces of the United States, or to a person mentally incompetent, or under other legal disability adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, such payment may be made to the legally constituted guardian, curator, or conservator of the person entitled to payment, or to the person found by the director to be otherwise legally vested with the care of the person entitled to payment or of his estate. Prior to the receipt of notice by the bureau that any such person entitled to payment is under such legal disability, payment may be made to such person direct."

SEC. 5. Title V of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 508. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act a veteran may, under regulations prescribed by the director, name more than one beneficiary, and may from time to time, with the approval of the director, change such beneficiaries. If the director is unable to ascertain the beneficiary named by the veteran, payment shall be made to the estate of the veteran."

SEC. 6. Section 702 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 702. Whoever knowingly makes any false or fraudulent statement of a material fact in any application, certificate, or document

made under the provisions of Title III, IV, V, VI, or VII, or of any regulation made under any such title, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$1,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

SEC. 7. This act shall not invalidate any payments made or applications received, before the enactment of this act, under the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended. Payments under awards heretofore or hereafter made shall be made to the dependent entitled thereto regardless of change in status, unless another dependent establishes to the satisfaction of the director a priority of preference under such act, as amended. Upon the establishment of such preference the remaining installments shall be paid to such dependent, but in no case shall the total payments under Title VI of such act, as amended (except section 608), exceed the adjusted service credit of the veteran.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

MR. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy Members; not a quorum.

MR. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 36]

Allen	Douglass, Mass.	King	Sproul, Kans.
Andresen	Douttrich	Knutson	Steagall
Anthony	Dowell	Kunz	Stobbs
Bacon	Doyle	LaGuardia	Strong, Pa.
Beck, Wis.	Fitzpatrick	Lampert	Strother
Bohn	Free	Larsen	Sullivan
Boles	Freeman	Lindsay	Sweet
Bowman	Frothingham	Lyon	Taylor, Tenn.
Boylan	Gallivan	Mead	Thompson
Brand, Ga.	Garrett, Tenn.	Michaelson	Tucker
Britten	Gibson	Mooney	Vestal
Busby	Gilbert	Moore, N. J.	Vinson, Ga.
Bushong	Golder	Moore, Ohio	Wainwright
Campbell	Goldsbrough	Norton, N. J.	Weller
Carew	Graham	O'Connor, N. Y.	Welsh, Pa.
Carley	Hale, N. H.	Palmer	White, Colo.
Carter	Hall, Ill.	Purnell	Williams, Tex.
Celler	Harrison	Rathbone	Williamson
Chase	Hill, Ala.	Reece	Wingo
Connally, Tex.	Houston	Robinson, Iowa	Winter
Connolly, Pa.	Hudson	Rubey	Wolverton
Cooper, Ohio	Hull, William E.	Rutherford	Wood
Cullen	Hull, Tenn.	Sabath	Woodrum
Davey	Igoe	Sanders, N. Y.	Wright
De Rouen	Johnson, Ill.	Sears, Fla.	Wurzbach
Dickstein	Kendall	Sirovich	Yates
Dominick	Kerr	Somers	
Douglas, Ariz.	Kludred	Spearing	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

MR. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

MR. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

MR. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi to 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GREEN. [Applause, the Members rising.]

MR. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank the House for the very complimentary reception just given me, which I suppose is in view of an anticipated event which in many ways is much to my regret. Yet, of course, the House understands that the present situation would not have developed had I not consented to it. At the proper time I hope to make further acknowledgment of the many kindnesses which I have received from the Members of this body. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House amending the adjusted compensation act has three distinct features. First, and probably the most important feature in the bill is that it extends for two years the time for filing applications for adjusted compensation. There are now in the office of the Veterans' Bureau some 30,000 applications on file which can not be granted under the present situation of the law, having been filed too late. My understanding is that about 27,000 defective applications were actually filed before the expiration of the time limit under the present law—that is, before January 1 last. The Secretary of War was trying to hold, and I think did hold, that

these applications might be correct when they were not in proper form by a subsequent amendment thereto. The Comptroller General, however, seemed to think that he had jurisdiction over the matter, and held that unless there was a proper application before the Secretary at the time, while the act was in force, the application could not be granted. And in that, as I understand, the Director of the Veterans' Bureau concurred. As a result none of these applications were granted, although a large number had endeavored to obtain the benefits of the law within the time prescribed by it.

Now, there is no good reason why all of these parties should not have their applications reinstated or why they should not be permitted to file. In fact, the testimony before the committee showed that a number of applicants for many reasons had not understood the rights they had under the law, or the benefits of it, and some did not understand that they had any privileges whatever granted to them. So far as increased appropriations are concerned, it will make no difference, because the sinking fund created by the original law will be ample to take care of the applications that can be filed. About 4,350,000 veterans are eligible to receive awards under the adjusted compensation, and approximately 3,500,000 applications have been filed. We should give the remainder another opportunity to file.

Another important matter related to lost applications, where applications had been received and returned for some reason, but the veterans contend that they never got their applications back, and as a consequence never succeeded in getting their applications allowed. Provision is made in the bill with reference to lost applications.

Then there is another matter that seems to the committee necessary in order to carry out the purposes of the bill, and that relates to cases where the veteran has been absent from his home for seven years. These cases should be treated as under the laws generally; that is, as if they were deceased, and their beneficiaries should be permitted to apply for the benefits of the adjusted compensation. This is provided for in the bill.

MR. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

MR. ALMON. Is there any provision of law for the certification of loss of certificates of discharge? That is, if a certificate is lost, is there any provision for securing a certified copy?

MR. GREEN of Iowa. I think that is in the original law. It is not provided for by this amendment made by the bill.

The other changes made by the bill may not seem of very great importance in some ways, but they were made for the purpose of making it easier and simpler for applications to be filed and granted. They are largely clerical, and unless some one has further questions to ask I shall not proceed any further at this time.

MR. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

MR. GREEN of Florida. I would like to say to the gentleman that the provision as reported by him is very reasonable. Today I had an application from a veteran who never qualified for adjusted compensation.

MR. GREEN of Iowa. There are still many who have not applied. The committee thought they should be entitled to the benefits of the act. We finally concluded to extend the period for two years. [Applause.]

MR. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I simply want to say, without taking up much of the time of the House, that this is a unanimous report. The committee went into it very carefully. The purposes have been fully explained by the chairman. We have extended the time for filing claims for adjusted compensation, and in three or four instances we have made amendments and perfected the law, which should have been done at the time the law was passed. But experience showed the defects, and they have been smoothed out.

But before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, I want personally to express my regret at severing relations on the committee with the chairman, who has been my friend. It was a pleasure to serve with him. He was courteous in every way, and while the Court of Claims has gained, yet I want to say that this House has suffered a loss. I wish for our chairman all the good things of life, and I want to say to the Members of the House that from my association with him, knowing his fairness and honesty and devotion to duty, I am convinced that the Court of Claims is going to be very fortunate to have a man like Mr. GREEN of Iowa as one of its members. [Applause.]

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [MR. CONNERY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, not having served on the committee with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], but having had several interesting, good-natured battles on the floor with him during my membership in this House, I want to take this occasion before I speak on the bill to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa and to say that I have the highest respect and esteem for him, have always appreciated his fine character, and wish him every success and all the good luck in the world when he leaves this House. [Applause.]

I am glad to see the Committee on Ways and Means come in with a unanimous report on this bill. There are 500,000 men who are going to benefit by this bill being passed to-day, and I hope it will be passed unanimously.

I do not wish to take up much time, but I would like to make a suggestion to all my colleagues, and that is that they get in touch with the service organizations in their districts and let these organizations know what the House of Representatives has done in this bill to-day and ask them to notify the service men in every congressional district of the United States that there is such a thing as a soldier's bonus. I say this very seriously because many of the service men have been so busy trying to scrape a living for themselves and their little families since the war that they have had small opportunity to keep in touch with the doings of Congress.

There are 500,000 men who evidently have not known that Congress passed a soldiers' bonus and have not applied for it. I know that in my own district I have sent out thousands of letters to the boys asking them and begging them to apply for their bonus, and some of them have come in since the time for filing elapsed on January 1 last. I merely wish to make that suggestion to my colleagues in the House so that these men may know they are eligible for the benefits of the adjusted compensation act.

In conclusion all I can say is that I congratulate the committee on their unanimous report and I hope this bill will pass unanimously. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I desire to speak briefly on the pending measure by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] to amend the adjusted compensation act. I was pleased with the enthusiasm Members of this body gave our distinguished colleague, author of the pending measure, when the announcement was made a few moments ago that he had been appointed to the Court of Claims. I know I voice the sentiment of each Member of this House, regardless of politics, when I say that we all regret to see him leave us, but rejoice in the fact that he has been so signally honored. May I say that during all of his public career he has never presented a more just measure than the one we now have before us.

Mr. Speaker, the measure now under consideration is of vital importance to more than 500,000 former service men, their wives, children, and dependents. The pending measure is of unusual interest to me for the reason that I have introduced a similar bill. In fact, I find that the committee has incorporated a part of my bill into this one, which proposes to extend for two years the time in which to file applications for adjusted compensation.

Permit me to say just here, Mr. Speaker, that I can not quite agree with the gentleman who preceded me in referring to this bill as a bonus. Oh, we have heard considerable talk concerning the so-called bonus for World War veterans, but I insist this is a misnomer. It is not a bonus. I submit that a bonus implies a gift.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. I merely wish to say to the gentleman that the reason I used the word "bonus" is that I have found that ex-service men do not differentiate between adjusted compensation and the disabled compensation which they get from the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I understand that to be true, but nevertheless, this measure is not a bonus nor a gift, and it is a gross injustice to our boys to refer to this as a bonus. The so-called bonus bill merely attempts to adjust partially the compensation of those soldiers who left home and loved ones and faced German machine guns at \$1 a day, suffering untold agonies during those terrible days of the war, while those who were employed at home drew their ten, fifteen, or twenty dollars per day.

It occurs to me that it is wrong to speak of this mere pittance as a bonus. They answered the call of our Government when we needed men as we have never needed them before and I hope and pray will never need them in the future. But now,

Mr. Speaker, we find that even this bagatelle granted to our soldiers by Congress in the place of the measure they asked for can not be collected by over a half million ex-soldiers for the reason that the date of filing for same has expired.

In the sixth Oklahoma district, the one I have the honor to represent in Congress, I learned that dependents of more than 100 World War veterans had not applied for adjusted compensation a few days prior to January 1, 1928. I sent telegrams to the newspapers in my district urging that they advise the public of the date of the expiration of the time for filing for adjusted compensation. I also wired the commanders of every American Legion post in my district, as well as others interested, and due to the splendid cooperation of my people, the best people on earth, we were able to get about 50 dependents of deceased veterans, many of whom were in great need, to apply for this compensation. But as to those others whom we failed to get in touch with, the door is forever closed unless Congress extends the time for those boys and their dependents to apply.

So I would say to the Members of the House that to my mind the most important feature of this bill is the provision extending the time for two additional years for applying for the adjusted compensation by former World War soldiers or their dependents. This bill extends the date from January 1, 1928, to January 1, 1930.

Then, there are other important provisions in this bill. This measure, if passed, will forever settle the time in which a person may be said to be legally dead. Under the existing law this matter is not clear. Unfortunately, all of our States do not have uniform laws. In some States it takes seven years for a person to be legally dead, while in others it takes four or more. But this measure forever settles the question of when a person is legally dead, and will aid many deserving dependents to collect what is rightfully theirs.

It might be of interest to you gentlemen to say that the American Legion and other veterans' organizations are backing this measure as well as others to amend the veterans' adjusted compensation act. I had the honor and pleasure to be a member of the resolutions committee of the last annual American Legion Convention, which met in Paris, France, last year. If I remember correctly, the relief sought by this measure was presented by our committee to the convention in the resolutions adopted at the Paris convention. Then, too, our legionnaires of Oklahoma, at their last convention, demanded that the adjusted compensation law be extended and clarified, and the time extended as this measure proposes to do. No doubt other States did likewise.

Mr. Speaker, to be perfectly frank, this bill does not offer as much relief as I had hoped would come from our committee. There are many other defects in the present law that to my mind ought to be corrected. I sincerely hope many corrections will be made before the Seventieth Congress adjourns. I have introduced some bills to do that and many other gentlemen have also offered some splendid measures that I hope we will get a chance to vote on. But merely because this measure does not correct all the evils of the present law I certainly would not raise my voice against the passage of this bill, and I sincerely trust that none of you will do so.

Let the news go forth that this Congress has done its duty in the passage of the pending measure and a cry of joy will go up in every nook and corner of America. Not only will the 500,000 or 600,000 of those directly affected by the passage of this measure be pleased to know we have done the square thing by our boys but all good patriotic citizens will rejoice to know Members of Congress have not forgotten the men who unflinchingly did their duty during those awful, never-to-be-forgotten days of the most terrible war the world has ever known.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on this particular bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their own remarks on this bill for five legislative days. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROWNING].

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I asked for this time merely to bring to the attention of the House one thing which I feel very deeply should have been done in connection with this measure. None of us objects to the provisions of the bill, but the persistent policy of bringing in every veterans' bill under suspension of the rules calls for repeated consideration of worthy provisions which should have been included before.

I will mention one thing, and I venture the assertion that there are not a dozen men in the House who would not concede its justness and its advisability as a provision of law. If a man got killed on the 11th of November, 1918, who had served the maximum amount of time, his family gets only the basic pay of \$625, whereas if a man served throughout the war without being killed and made his application and died the day after making his said application, his family gets the full amount of the adjusted service certificate, which is about three times as much as the other family received.

Now, this is unfair. If a man died the day before he could have made his application under the law, his family gets simply basic pay; whereas if a man died the day after making his application under the law, his family gets the full amount of the adjusted service certificate. This is a glaring discrimination and puts a penalty on a man because he either got killed in service or died before he had an opportunity under the law to make his application.

Mr. MANLOVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. MANLOVE. I quite agree with the gentleman as to the sentiment of the House, but was this matter presented to the committee?

Mr. BROWNING. I will assure the gentleman the matter has been presented repeatedly.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I wish to remind the gentleman that when this adjusted compensation bill was first passed we on this side of the House who are ex-service men took the position that there was only one thing to do, and that was to pay the same amount of cash to all.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman does not state the matter so the House will understand it. I know the gentleman wants to state it fairly.

Mr. BROWNING. I will be glad for the gentleman to correct any misstatement I have made.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In one case they get the cash in a lump sum and in the other case they get it in 20 years.

Mr. BROWNING. Oh, no. The bureau can pay it all in cash if they want to. When the man dies his certificate has matured.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes; but he is not in the same position as the other man.

Mr. BROWNING. They usually pay it in 10 quarterly payments and settle it all in two and one-half years.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman would consider a beneficiary who gets the cash at once in the same position as one who may have to wait 20 years. Life insurance companies do not treat the matter in that way. If this is insurance, it should be treated as such.

Mr. BROWNING. Of course, if the gentleman wants to say that the Government can quibble over technicalities, that is all right. I admit these boys can not sue the Government and make them pay it, but I say that this House, in order to do justice, should have put a provision of that kind in this bill, and I venture the assertion further that had this bill come in with privilege of offering this one amendment there would not have been a dozen votes against it. This is one of the most glaring discriminations that are constantly being made with veterans' measures, and surely the gentleman who is the chairman of this committee, and whom we all love, is not afraid to defend his bill on the floor. Surely the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation would not be afraid to defend its bill on the floor, and surely the House is not going to do something that is crazy.

If they would just give us the privilege of considering one adjusted compensation measure and one veterans' measure with open discussion on the floor, with privilege of amendment, where we could arrive at the accumulated wisdom of the Members of this House, then we would all be satisfied and we would not have to do it over every year. [Applause.]

I simply wanted to register my protest against this kind of procedure, wherein we are forever denied the privilege of amendment and discussion of any kind of veterans' legislation on this floor.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. May I ask this question for the sake of bringing before the membership of the House an interesting bit of information? When the President vetoed the bonus bill he said: "The veterans as a whole do not want it"; but, according to the figures brought in to-day by the chairman of the Ways

and Means Committee, it appears that 87 per cent have already wanted it.

Mr. BROWNING. Yes; I think the President was mistaken.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I did not take this time to throw bouquets at the Ways and Means Committee but to offer this criticism. This is not a bonus. This is adjusted compensation. It belongs to these men, and it seems to me that it is unnecessary to be passing these measures every two years and hedging them about with these limitations. Besides, there is a flagrant discrimination in this law which I have been trying to get corrected.

I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROWNING] that we ought to have been permitted to amend this bill on the floor. If a veteran—listen to this—if a veteran dies and leaves a dependent brother or sister, I do not care if he is only 5 or 10 years old, under this bill he can not get his adjusted compensation.

This is property. It is a part of his wages as a soldier in the Army and it ought to go to his dependents or to his estate when he dies if he has not lived to make the application himself; and I should like to see the Ways and Means Committee bring in one of these bills, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROWNING] has said, and let us amend it to take care of all these men. You are going to have to do it. You are not saving anything by this piecemeal legislation every two years. We are going to continue this drive until all these boys or their families or their estates have had an opportunity to secure the benefits coming to them under the adjusted compensation act. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair the vote is unanimous.

So the bill was passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—ADJUSTED COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under the general leave granted to extend remarks on H. R. 10487, "An act to amend the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended," I take this opportunity to make some observations on this proposed legislation. It is unfortunate that bills of this kind are brought up for consideration on the floor of the House under suspension of the rules. This precludes amendments and limits debate to 40 minutes, 20 minutes to those who favor the proposed legislation and 20 minutes to those opposed. Members are thus precluded from discussing the merits of the bill on the floor as the limit of time will not permit, and amendments, however meritorious, can not be proposed or considered by the House membership.

The privilege of extending remarks in the RECORD is the only method by which a Member can voice his sentiments either for or against legislation when considered by the House under suspension of the rules as this bill is considered.

I am heartily in favor of the bill. It is a piece of meritorious legislation. There is an inequality in the law as it exists, however, that is not cured by this bill. If a soldier was killed prior to the signing of the armistice in November, 1918, his dependents get the basic pay only, whereas the dependents of a soldier surviving that date, where application has been made, get the full benefit of the adjusted service certificate in the event of the death of the soldier later. This is an inequality that should be remedied and I am confident would have been remedied by the House if an opportunity had been given to consider amendments.

Under existing law the time within which application might be made for adjusted compensation expired January 1, 1928. Some 500,000 veterans and dependents to whom compensation was available failed through neglect or ignorance of statutory limitation to make claim. Perhaps some of these do not care to claim the benefits of the act, but those who do desire to make claim and failed to do so through neglect or otherwise should not be denied that right. Under the proposed bill such applications may be filed on or before January 2, 1930. I am glad to see the time extended to January 2, 1930.

I understand some 30,000 applications have already been received by the War and Navy Departments since the time under existing law for filing expired.

Many thousand more will doubtless be filed when the veterans are advised of their rights. Some from my own district have written me that they failed to claim adjusted compensa-

tion before the time limit. This amendment will restore their right to claim their adjusted compensation.

Dependents likewise have the right to file within the time allowed veterans, and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, under regulations to be prescribed by them, may designate some one to make the application without the necessity of a legal guardian being appointed by the courts. Provision is likewise made in the case of lost applications. In such case the application shall be considered as valid when originally filed.

Another wise provision of the bill is the provision in the case of veterans who have been missing for a period of seven years or more. In such cases there is a presumption of death and applications by dependents of such veterans after such time are authorized.

The bill will afford relief to many deserving veterans and their dependents, and I hope it will meet with favor in the body at the other end of the Capitol and receive Executive approval.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration is to amend the World War adjusted compensation act and has for its three main purposes, first, the extension for a period of two years the time within which application may be filed for the adjusted compensation. This time expired on January 1, 1928; and if this bill finally passes the Senate and is approved by the President it will extend the time to January 1, 1930.

It is estimated there were some 4,350,000 soldiers eligible to receive the benefits of the adjusted compensation act. The statement has been made during the discussion of this bill that 3,795,000 ex-service men have made application up to the present time, and that of the applications made 3,498,000 have been allowed. This leaves approximately 500,000 ex-service men who have not yet applied for this adjusted compensation.

The second important matter in the bill is an administrative one making the determination of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy concerning the validity of a lost application final.

The third purpose of the bill is to extend the benefits of the act to dependents of veterans who have been absent from home continuously and without explanation for a period of seven years. In other words, the act extends the presumption of death of ex-service men who have been absent and not heard from for more than seven years.

This bill should and will pass the House unanimously. I am glad to support it as I have supported all other legislation recommended for the ex-service men.

I was a Member of the House in 1917 during the World War, and the responsibility was in part mine to assist in the enactment of legislation to help win the war. We passed then all of the needed legislation not only to raise an Army and to strengthen the Navy but to clothe and equip them. We voted large sums of money and massed all of our resources in order that the war might be speedily terminated.

In the short period from April, 1917, to the date of the armistice, November 11, 1918, approximately 4,350,000 of the flower of our youth joined the Army. About half of them were thrown across the sea. They were given but little training, but they gave a splendid account of themselves. The fact that legislation was enacted to mass our men and resources enabled us to speedily terminate the war. Our allies had not won an important engagement before our soldiers reached France. They were dispirited and discouraged. In the preliminary or rather minor parts our soldiers took in the engagements after reaching France they gave a good account of themselves. They heartened the Allies and discouraged the enemy troops.

In the middle of July, 1918, we joined in the Battle of Chateau Thierry and relieved Paris and turned the tide of battle. In September we took the offensive in the St. Mihiel drive and won a glorious and sweeping victory. Immediately following we took an important part in the Argonne offensive, and our soldiers made it possible for us to win that victory and to bring to a close the bloodiest war in all history on November 11, 1918.

During the war I earnestly supported all measures for its prosecution. Since its conclusion I have voted for every generous consideration to be given to the ex-service men who enrolled under our colors and made it possible to carry our flag to a triumphant victory. During the war we appropriated money to make it possible to assist in caring for the dependents at home while our soldiers were away fighting for their country. Upon the termination of the war we voted for vocational education to rehabilitate the disabled. We built hospitals and we made provision for alleviating the pain and suffering and caring for the wounded. We voted for the adjusted compensation act and all amendments thereto. During the war we voted for the provision authorizing the men in arms to be insured at a reasonable rate. We have voted to continue the time within which application may be made for

the adjusted compensation. We believe that this Government should be generous with those who enrolled under our colors and made it possible, in an incredibly short time, to bring to a successful close this great war. Our responsibility does not end here. We should continue to take care of the dependents of those who gave their lives for their country. We should hospitalize and care for those who are wounded and afflicted. We should be generous in the administration of our laws in passing upon claims for compensation.

Many of our soldiers were anxious to return home upon discharge, and did not know that the strain and hardship they had undergone would so soon wreck their health and disable them to an extent that they would not be able to support themselves. Many of them are called upon for proof they are unable to supply, as in many cases the best individual records were not kept. They know they entered the Government service strong and healthy and able to do an unlimited amount of work and to support themselves and those dependent upon them. Within a short time after their discharge their strength failed and they found themselves afflicted with disease and yet many of them do not have the connecting link of testimony which is sufficiently strong and convincing to prove that their disabilities were of service origin. My criticism is that this testimony should be more generously construed and I think all of the presumption should be indulged in favor of the ex-service men. Congress has enacted much favorable legislation and it should not be neutralized and made of no benefit because it is not sympathetically administered. We will continue to support hospitals with generous appropriations and, as I stated a moment ago, we will continue to take care of the disabled and their dependents who lost life and health in the service of their country.

Just one word more. I want to invite attention to the fact that this bill is brought up under suspension of the rules of the House. Now, the public does not understand what this means. It means this: That the leaders of the House are not, and have never been, willing to permit Congress to consider legislation for the benefit of the ex-service men at a time and in such a way that amendments may be offered and the whole subject opened up for consideration, discussion, and amendment. During the past five years we have not had an opportunity in the House to consider soldier legislation upon its merits with an opportunity for amendment. Under the rules under which this bill is being considered no amendment can be offered, and Members of the House must vote either for or against a motion to suspend the rules of the House and pass the bill. This requires a two-thirds vote. Of course, no Member of the House will vote against any bill for the relief of the ex-service men, however small. Many of us, however, would like an opportunity to have a bill brought before the House when the whole subject may be considered at length and when amendments expressive of the will of the House may be offered and considered and voted upon. I do not recall, during the past six years, any bill affecting soldiers that has been permitted to be brought before the House for a full consideration with an opportunity for amendment, and no bill of any consequence, as I now recall, since the final termination of the war.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to submit the following:

As is quite often the case when a law is enacted, after it has been in force for a while it is found that changes are necessary in order to cover the full intent of the law. I feel sure this was the case in the adjusted compensation law, and I am heartily in favor of the changes which have been made by the amendments to that act.

In my district in New York a great many of the veterans who are eligible to receive the benefits of this act have not taken advantage of it. In many instances it was through ignorance of the law, and when they did learn of it it was too late to file their applications. I am informed many thousands of applications were received by the Navy and War Departments which were of no value to the applicants until some new legislation was enacted. Now, upon the extension of the time they can receive the benefits to which they are so justly entitled. There is no question of asking for additional appropriations to carry out the law with the added amendments, as I am advised the sinking fund created by the original law will take care of any additional applications which will be made.

Then, too, the question of the dependents is a very vital one. I know in a great many cases the veterans did not return to their homes. In some instances they have been located and restored to their families, but in most cases this is not the rule and it is nothing but fair the dependents of those veterans should receive the benefits of the act, even if they are not able to produce evidence of the death of the veteran.

I think this measure as it now stands is thoroughly satisfying to the American Legion and other veterans' organizations and I feel the Ways and Means Committee were very just in their report on the bill and am most happy to know the law is so amended as to cover many needed points.

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 10487 has for its purpose the extending of the period of time two years longer in order that the ex-service men who are entitled to the same may file for their adjusted service compensation. It is stated that some 850,000 veterans or their dependents failed to apply for the adjusted service compensation; that there are pending now before the United States Veterans' Bureau some 57,000 applications which were either filed too late or are defective.

This legislation, then, gives further time in which to file applications and gives opportunity for the correction of defective applications. A further feature is that lost applications can be properly accounted for and validated and permits the filing of new applications as of the date of the original filing.

If a veteran has continued an unexplained absence from his home and family for a period of seven years, and that fact is shown by evidence, by the enactment of this legislation the Veterans' Bureau is authorized to consider the death of the veteran to exist.

This will permit the disposition of what the ex-service man would be legally entitled to from the Government to go to his legal dependents.

Many other features of this amendment tend to more clearly solve some of the complications that have arisen before the bureau of the Government having in charge the interpretation of legislation for veterans of the World War.

The present amendments are intended directly to assist those who have neglected, or through lack of proper knowledge have failed, to avail themselves of the benefits conferred by legislation for their services to our country; and in case of the death of the veteran so that his dependents may receive the benefits to which the soldier is justly entitled.

The entire bonus insurance plan will cost the Government something like \$2,000,000.

The World War cost the Nation the sum of \$423,405,993 for the first three months of the war (April 6 to June 30, 1917); war expenditures for the fiscal year 1917-18 were \$8,242,039,268; and those for the fiscal year 1918-19 are placed at \$14,312,821,707. (Page 87, "War Costs and Their Financing" by E. L. Bogart, professor of economics, University of Illinois and sometimes assistant foreign trade adviser in the United States Department of State.)

That all men who served in that war should share in the bonus insurance was the purpose of the legislation first enacted by Congress. The purpose of this amended legislation is that in due time all of the ex-service men, or in case of their death then their legal dependents, will receive that which the original law intended.

The soldiers of the World War should be so treated by this Government that should there still remain nations who believe that the power of might should be the dominant spirit in affairs of government, a true patriotism may exist among those who served this country in its hour of need; that our now soldier citizen may keep alive in the people a spirit of love of country and patriotic duty for the protection of the principles of government.

It is to this end that a national defense day has been established and designated by the President each year. Not that a spirit of war may be created, but rather that a true spirit of patriotism and national pride may be fostered in the Nation.

Our four million and more World War veterans should be treated by a fair national policy to feel that our Government is a just Government. The Government has legislated in many ways since the close of the World War for the veterans; it has expended in care, hospitalization, etc., an enormous sum of money.

For the information of our citizens I desire to insert here the casualties of the various wars our Nation has figured in. Then let us carefully contemplate the grief and sorrow which have been caused in our own country and similarly in all the world.

CASUALTIES

(Information digested from sources cited)

REVOLUTIONARY WAR

From the Battle of Lexington to the surrender of Yorktown, in 24 engagements, the American losses in the field were about 8,000. (Collier's New Encyclopedia, v. 15, p. 6686.)

WAR OF 1812

The number killed in battle was about 1,500; the total killed and wounded in land battles not far from 5,000; and the grand total of

losses, including prisoners, 9,700. (Kendric C. Babcock. The Rise of American Nationality, v. 13 of the American Nation, edited by A. B. Hart. Harper & Bros., 1906, p. 188.)

MEXICAN WAR

Total losses were 1,549 killed or died of wounds; 10,986 died of disease. The mortality from disease was 110 per 1,000 per annum; the battle losses, 15. (Capt. Louis C. Duncan, Medical Department of the United States Army in the Civil War. Informally issued by Surgeon General's Office. Seaman prize essay appended, pp. 24, 25.)

CIVIL WAR

For the Union armies the total number of deaths was 359,528. Of these, 67,058 were killed in battle and 43,012 died of wounds, giving a total of 110,070 deaths from battle casualties, equivalent to a rate of 33 per 100 per annum. For Confederate armies it is estimated that the battle losses were 94,000 and that twice as many died of disease. (Capt. Louis C. Duncan, Medical Department, etc., p. 28.)

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

Total deaths from all causes in the Army were 2,910, including 280 killed. The wounded numbered 1,577, of whom 65 died. Died of disease, 2,565. (U. S. War Dept. annual reports, 1898; v. 1, pt. 1, p. 272.)

PHILIPPINE INSURRECTION

Following were the losses sustained by United States troops: Killed, 777; died of wounds, 227; died of disease, 2,572; died of miscellaneous causes, 588; total deaths, 4,165; wounded, 2,911. (U. S. Dept. of War annual reports, 1902, v. 1, p. 291.)

WORLD WAR

United States:	
Mobilized	4, 272, 521
Dead	67, 813
Wounded	192, 483
Prisoners or missing	14, 363
Total	274, 659

(The new International Yearbook, 1918, p. 761.)

We note the above figures and are struck with awe at the horrors of war. Yet with all of this, the obligation is imposed upon each child born to the Nation, when that child reaches the age of accountability, to realize its duty of defending the honor, integrity, and stability of the country.

I believe nations can avoid war. The real principle in government is justice, and it should be the highest function of government to give the nation peace.

The words of the Father of His Country, George Washington, in his Farewell Address are brought to mind—

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it.

The words of the great statesman should make us realize that the achievements of our powerful Nation in the World War must never be used in a selfish way to overawe other or weaker nations by subjecting them to anything in government intercourse which may be construed as an attempt by us as a Nation to overlord or dictate to them.

The principles of our Government should never be used to the extent of permitting or protecting unsound or selfish business interests of our citizens in foreign countries; a policy to which our country is consciously or unconsciously drifting. It behooves our Government as a Nation not to take offense at every whim of some of the minor republics. I feel the truth of the words of a prominent statesman when he recently referred to our attitude toward our sister Republic below the Rio Grande: "God made them our neighbor; let us pray that justice will make them our friend."

The thought I am presenting in these remarks is that we should instill in our youth that the horrors of war, destruction, and wanton waster of human life, together with the destruction of national property, ought to be by some intelligent method prevented in the future.

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION AT SEVILLE, SPAIN

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the accompanying recommendation of the Secretary of State, I request of the Congress legislation that

will authorize the appropriations heretofore made or hereafter to be made under the authority of Public Resolution No. 65, approved March 3, 1925, providing for the participation of the United States in an international exposition to be held in Seville, Spain, to be expended, for the purposes enumerated in the resolution, without regard to the provisions of any other act relating to the expenditure of public moneys, on the certificate of the Secretary of State that the materials or services were necessary to enable the Government of the United States to participate in the exposition.

The attention of Congress is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State and the memorandum of the Commission of the United States to the International Exposition at Seville, in which the details with regard to the necessity of the proposed amendment are set forth.

THE WHITE HOUSE, Washington.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

INCREASE OF CIVIL WAR WIDOWS' PENSIONS

Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 10159) granting pensions and increase of pensions to widows and former widows of certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War with an amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the widow or former widow of any person who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the Civil War for 90 days or more, and was honorably discharged from all contracts of service, or regardless of the length of service was discharged for disability incurred in service and in the line of duty, such widow or former widow having been married to the soldier, sailor, or marine prior to the 27th day of June, 1905, and who is now or may hereafter attain the age of 75 years and is pensioned as such widow or former widow under the general pension law, or whose name may hereafter be placed on the pension roll under existing laws, shall be paid a pension at the rate of \$40 a month, but nothing in this act shall be construed as decreasing the rate of pension granted by any other act.

SEC. 2. That the pension or increase of the rate of pension herein provided for, as to all persons whose names are now on the pension roll, or who are now in receipt of a pension under existing law, shall commence at the rate herein provided, on the fourth day of the next month after the approval of this act; and as to persons whose names are not now on the pension roll, or who are not now in receipt of a pension under existing law but who may be entitled to a pension under the general pension laws, such pensions shall commence from the date of filing application therefor in the Bureau of Pensions after the approval of this act in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the issue of a check in payment of a pension for which the execution and submission of a voucher was not required shall constitute payment in the event of the death of the pensioner on or after the last day of the period covered by such check, and it shall not be canceled, but shall become an asset of the estate of the deceased pensioner.

SEC. 3. That no claim agent, attorney, or other person shall demand, receive, or accept fees or compensation for the presentation or preparation of any such claim for increase in pension under this act, or be recognized as agent or attorney in the prosecution or adjudication of a claim for increase under this act, and any such person who shall violate any of the provisions of this section, or wrongfully withhold from a pensioner the whole or any part of the pension allowed or due a pensioner under this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall, for each and every offense, be fined not to exceed \$500 or imprisonment not to exceed one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 4. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with or inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby modified and amended only so far and to the extent herein specifically provided and stated.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I think all the Members of the House are familiar with this bill. It is in the same form that it was when the bill passed the former House increasing the pension from \$30 to \$40. When the widow reaches the age of 75 it automatically advances the pension.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This bill relates to widows of the Civil War?

Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD. Yes; and former widows.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is not there a mistake in the spelling on page 2, line 18? The word "commerce" should be "commence."

Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD. I think that is true.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the spelling on line 18, page 2, be corrected; that the spelling of the word "commence" be corrected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five minutes.

Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen of the House, I demanded a second for the reason that I thought that there should be some discussion of the bill under consideration. This bill, as stated, was reported as a substitute by our committee for the many general pension bills which have been referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. The bill provides in part for pensions and increase of pensions to the amount of \$40 per month for those widows and former widows who married subsequent to the discharge of their husbands from the Civil War, and prior to June 27, 1905, provided that they are now or may hereafter attain the age of 75 years. I believe the bill should have been amended to provide a monthly pension allowance of \$50 for all widows of Civil War veterans who are now entitled to pensions under our general pension laws.

At a joint meeting of the Senate Committee on Pensions and the House Committee on Invalid Pensions held on January 18, 1928, hearings were had on the question of pension legislation. Representatives of the Grand Army of the Republic and allied organizations who appeared at this hearing unanimously stated that the present allowance to widows is grossly insufficient to decently support them; that most of the widows on the pension rolls are between 80 and 90 years of age, feeble, infirm, and unable to work or earn a livelihood, and many of them in destitute circumstances. The Grand Army of the Republic, Women's Relief Corps, Daughters of Union Veterans, Sons of Veterans, and Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, through their representatives, urgently supported and indorsed the proposition that a uniform allowance of \$50 per month should be granted to widows of Civil War veterans who now have a pensionable status under the general pension laws. The evidence before the committee also disclosed that the widows are dying at about the rate of 11,000 annually. The names of 1,569 widows were dropped from the rolls during the month of December, 1927. The bill which has been reported and will pass this House does extend some relief, but not to the extent warranted by the emergency. The arbitrary age provision incorporated in this bill providing for an increase only to those who are now or may hereafter attain the age of 75 years is discriminatory for the reason that it leaves out in the cold thousands of deserving widows who have spent the best part of their lives in administering to the wants and needs of our veterans in their declining years.

In view of the high cost of living, it will not be seriously argued that the proposition of the majority of the committee to increase the present allowance \$10 per month is adequate, just, or fairly meets the situation. The present bill is a makeshift and a refusal to squarely face the issue and grant a sufficient and reasonable allowance to these widows for their decent and necessary support in the few remaining years of their lives.

The Senate has already favorably reported at this session a bill carrying an allowance of \$50 per month to widows of Civil War veterans who are now entitled to a pension under the general law. Why should the House hesitate to go along with the Senate? In the past our committee has reported favorably to the House a bill increasing the rate to \$50 per month. On April 9, 1926, our committee favorably reported by unanimous vote the Elliott bill, which recommended an increase to \$50 per month in pensions payable to those widows who were married prior to the 27th day of June, 1915. According to the report submitted in behalf of the bill to which I refer, H. R. 4023, I believe it was stated that such increase was not in conflict with the President's financial program. I refer the Members of the House to pages 1 and 2 of report No. 818, to accompany H. R. 4023. That report further stated—and the provisions therein were applicable to the widows as well as the veterans—that "the committee considered the bill as an emergency measure," further stating "that whatever more is to be done for these old soldiers and widows must be done soon. They are fast passing to their reward, where a grateful Nation can do no more to pay the debt it owes to them. To-day the average age of the widows is nearly 75

years." I call attention to the last paragraph of that report, which reads:

If this bill becomes a law, it will probably be the last expression of Congress in trying to discharge the debt of gratitude which the Nation owes to its saviors in its hour of darkest peril and to their dependents. In view of the rapid decrease in the number of these old veterans and widows, the increase granted by this bill will not be a burden on the Treasury for long, and your committee earnestly recommends the passage of H. R. 4023 at an early date.

In view of the attitude of the Committee on Invalid Pensions two years ago and that assumed by the Members of this Congress who have frequently and repeatedly expressed their views to the effect that they favored an adequate and substantial increase in pensions for these aged women, are we able to reconcile our views with the provisions of the bill under consideration? It was stated then that immediate action was needed; that they are rapidly passing to their final reward; that they originally received but meager pensions.

Does not a greater emergency exist to-day than existed some two years ago? We are advised that these widows are dying at the rate of about 11,000 annually. In a few years all will have passed into the silent land. Our Government is definitely committed to the policy of providing for their comfortable support and maintenance.

Mr. MANLOVE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANLOVE. Can the gentleman tell the House offhand how much increased burden this will impose on the Treasury, this \$10 increase? I refer to the increase carried in the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The cost of the bill for the first year will be approximately \$10,800,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. Those figures are on the assumption that there are no deaths; but if the widows continue to die at the rate of 1,100 a month, as under present conditions, the additional sum carried by this bill will be negligible.

Mr. MANLOVE. Then at what rate are the widows dying?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I may say in answer to the gentleman's inquiry, that according to the figures furnished our committee, during the month of December, 1927, 1,569 widows died or their names were dropped from the rolls of the Pension Bureau.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am also informed that during the past year approximately 11,000 widows have died. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I call attention to the fact that while a certain number of these widows will die every year, a certain other number will be coming on, arriving at the age of 75 years, so that they will take up all of this increase.

Mr. MANLOVE. And for what period of time does the gentleman think that these poor old widows will continue to come on?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. But some of us are interested in finding out whether the President of the United States is going to veto this bill, as he did the soldiers' bonus bill.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. I do not think that would be very good politics at this time.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. I think the gentleman has overlooked the most important feature of the bill, in the fact that a woman who has been married to a Civil War veteran since 1905, 23 years, deserves the extra \$10 a month as much as if she had been married to the veteran a day previous to the 27th day of June, 1905. If it were possible, I think this bill should be rereferred to the committee, and we should strike out any reference whatever to 75 years of age. A woman certainly deserves the \$10 a month extra regardless of whether she reaches the age of 75 years or not, if she was married to the veteran before 1905. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think what the gentleman says is true. I do not believe that we ought to fix an arbitrary date or age. If a widow has lived with a veteran for 15 or 20 years continuously and has cared for that veteran and ministered to his wants as a dutiful wife, certainly she is deserving, regardless of an arbitrary marriage date or age.

Mr. MANLOVE. But under the gentleman's own argument does he not fix a date when he says that if a widow has lived

with a veteran for a period of 15 years? In his own mind he is fixing a date back to the beginning of the 15-year period.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No. As it is now, only those who were married prior to June 27, 1905, have a pensionable status.

Mr. MANLOVE. That is all right, but the gentleman does not want himself understood as saying that he would eliminate the period of date. Some young women may have married old soldiers a few days ago, without limitation of date.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Suppose a woman married a veteran.

Mr. MANLOVE. On what date?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In June, 1905, and lived with him up to the present time. Then she has lived with him for approximately 23 years, and I say, regardless of the date, if she has lived with him for that time she certainly should be considered as having earned some consideration.

Mr. MANLOVE. But that is quite a different proposition. The gentleman said that he would eliminate both date and age.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would in this bill, but I would include an amendment to the effect that she must have lived with the veteran continuously for a reasonable period of time and have cohabited with him for, say, 15 or 20 years.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. GREENWOOD. As I understand the gentleman, in referring to the arbitrary date of June 27, 1905, that law was passed about 1917. At that time the widow would have lived with the soldier about 12 years, in order to obtain a pension. Maintaining that arbitrary date down to this time, the widow would have lived with the soldier for 23 years. If it was right, when it was first passed as an arbitrary date, it is not equitable now, and the point I understood the gentleman to make is that instead of fixing an arbitrary date you should require a period of time that they should have lived with the soldier and at the time of his death have lived with him for 15 or 20 years. Then the time or the date will follow, as the time goes on, and they will all be treated on an equitable basis of time they have lived with the soldier, so that the arbitrary date fixed some years ago can not be right now.

Mr. MANLOVE. I agree with the gentleman, if that is the point he contends for.

Mr. GREENWOOD. The gentleman agrees with the gentleman from Ohio on that point.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; that was my contention. I do not care to take further time, but I do want to discuss the present system that has grown up in the House of granting increases of pension by special act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield myself two additional minutes. The present system of increasing widows' pensions by private pension bills is discriminatory, unfair, and unjust. As a result of this system, a few widows, by the activity of their Representatives in Congress, secure a pension allowance of \$50 per month, while the great majority of widows are denied this relief and compelled to get along on \$30 per month. Manifestly, it is unfair, giving a few thousand widows \$50 per month by private pension bills and denying that allowance to thousands of other widows who are equally aged, equally infirm, equally indigent, and equally deserving. All are practically on the same basis in reference to age, health, and financial condition. All should be treated alike. Thousands of widows are discriminated against unintentionally, thus favoring a few.

The action of Congress in this respect is unfair, unjust, and inequitable. We should correct these abuses and the favoritism that has grown up under our system of granting increases in pensions by private act. Thousands of special bills have been introduced at this session. The chances are that few of them will be acted upon. No doubt the most of them are meritorious claims. We can only relieve this intolerable condition by passing a fair and equitable general law which will provide for the payment of a pension of \$50 monthly to those widows who have a pensionable status under our general pension laws.

We have pending before our committee to-day several thousand bills, special acts, introduced by Members of Congress, granting to widows an increase of pension from \$30 to \$50 a month. Practically all of us introduce such bills. I am informed we may not have an omnibus pension bill during this session. The investigator of our committee is unable to examine and give attention to all the special bills introduced.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Why can not the committee get a couple more investigators? Does the gentleman mean that Members of Congress are going to discriminate in favor of one widow as against another who is just as infirm?

Mr. MANLOVE. I want to say that the Committee on Invalid Pensions has less appropriations for it than it is entitled to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I do not believe it is the intention of Members of Congress to discriminate, but our omnibus pension bills only include those meritorious cases which are brought to the attention of our committee by Members of the House or Senate. We all know that for every worthy case relieved there are hundreds of other cases equally meritorious that do not receive consideration because the claimants' condition has not been brought to the attention of some Member of the House or Senate. Relief by special act is unfair to a certain extent, unintentionally and without fault on the part of the membership of the House. We should either discontinue the practice of passing special acts or pass a general pension bill that is just and equitable to all. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD] to suspend the rules and pass the bill with an amendment.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am unable to understand why pension bills, and especially this bill, is brought up for consideration on the floor of the House under suspension of the rules. Such consideration limits debate to 20 minutes to those in favor of the bill and 20 minutes to those opposed to the proposed legislation, and amendments are not in order and can not be considered. Discussion of the bill by the House membership on the floor is out of the question owing to the limited time. A number of the Members of the House would like to discuss the merits and demerits of the bill and offer and discuss meritorious amendments.

The only way a Member can voice his approval or disapproval of the bill, or inequalities in the bill which should be cured by amendments, is to take advantage of the privilege of extending his remarks in the RECORD. I am taking advantage of that privilege as the only way I can register my views on the proposed legislation. It is necessary to vote the bill up or down, and we are required to support the bill, with all its defects, for the good there is in it, and at the same time take it with all its defects and inequalities.

That is bad practice. I do not think the House would go wild on legislation of this kind in their desire to do justice. I believe an opportunity should be afforded to propose and consider amendments that would add materially to the general benefits of the bill. This bill does not go as far as it should.

At the last session the Invalid Pensions Committee reported favorably to the House a bill recommending a uniform increase to \$50 per month. Why the change of the committee's attitude at this session in reporting a bill to make the uniform allowance of but \$40 per month is more than I can understand. I am pleased to see that eight members of that committee are in accord with my views and have joined in a minority report. It ought to be at least \$50 per month and I am sure the membership here, if they had an opportunity to vote directly on the proposition, would make a uniform allowance of \$50 a month.

The Government can afford to be liberal to its defenders and their widows and adequately provide for them in their declining years. Most of these widows are from 75 to 90 years of age, feeble and infirm, unable to work and earn a living, and many of them are practically destitute. They have ministered with love and kindly affection to our country's defenders and added to their peace and contentment in their declining years.

Reports show that the mortality rate is about 11,000 a year. But a few years more and all will have passed away. We should add to their comfort, peace, and happiness in their declining years. They have performed noble service in ministering to the wants and needs of those whose patriotism and sacrifices and hardships have insured the perpetuity of our Government.

Another most glaring defect in the bill is that which permits the pensionable status to remain as of June 27, 1905. Either the date of the pensionable status should be moved up to a later period or the status should be based upon the number of years the widow lived with her soldier husband, administering to his necessities and comforts. Thousands of widows throughout the

country were married to their soldier husbands subsequent to June 27, 1905. No relief whatever is provided these widows. They should have been taken care of by amendment to the bill.

The law first fixing the pensionable status as June 27, 1905, was passed in 1916. The date of the pensionable status was then fixed 11 years prior to the enactment of the law, so that a designing woman would have no incentive in marrying a veteran primarily for the purpose of getting a pension for life upon his death. Twenty-three years have elapsed since the date fixed for determining a pensionable status. The reason for fixing this pensionable status at the arbitrary date of June 27, 1905, has ceased. Either that date should be fixed about 1920 or the pensionable status should be determined on the basis of marriage relation existing for some 10 or 15 years prior to the death of the soldier.

Special bills will continue to be filed to take care of these widows who have been married subsequent to June 27, 1905, and the congestion of private bills in the Invalid Pensions Committee will be relieved but very little. If I had my way about it, I would fix the pensionable status at 10 years existence of the marriage relation prior to the death of the soldier. The widow who lives with her soldier husband and administers to his wants and necessities for a period of 10 years is in justice entitled to a pensionable status. If widows who had been married and lived with their soldier husbands for a period of 10 years up to the time of the soldier's death were granted a uniform pension of \$50 a month, a greater degree of justice would have been done to these surviving widows.

As the bill it does not do justice to these widows who have so nobly and valiantly stood by their soldier husbands and ministered to them in their declining years. I believe such a bill would have passed the House by an overwhelming vote and I do not believe there would be just grounds for Executive disapproval, in view of the fact that these widows are so rapidly passing away. In the month of December, 1927, 1,569 widows died, or their names were dropped from the pension rolls in the Pension Bureau.

With this rapid increase in the mortality rate, it could not be much of a strain on the Federal Treasury, and those of us who are sincerely interested and the citizens of America generally who are interested in seeing that our old soldiers and their widows are adequately provided for would have the satisfaction of feeling at least that justice had been done.

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, House bill 10159 has passed the House. This bill provides an increase of pensions to widows of the soldiers of the Civil War when said widows have attained the age of 75 years.

This legislation will, no doubt, assist several thousand widows of veterans of the Civil War, and the increase will provide at least a means for securing the necessities of life during the remainder of their years upon earth.

In looking over a memorandum I notice a statement made by a former Senator from New Mexico five years ago, that at that time there were 488 widows of the veterans of the Civil War still living who were then 94 years of age or over; that there were 157,000 widows over the age of 74 years. Since that time the department states that many thousands of these widows have passed away, and that the widows are dying at the rate of 11,000 a year. During the month of December, 1927, 1,569 of these widows were stricken off the pension rolls.

The bill provides that widows who married the Civil War veterans before July 27, 1905, are entitled to the increase from \$30 to \$40 per month. So this legislation does not place on the pension rolls widows who married the veterans subsequent to July 27, 1905.

The mortality of these surviving widows is increasing rapidly at this time, and naturally must increase much more from this time on. The increase of \$10 per month is provided for those who have passed the biblical period of threescore and fifteen, and who have heretofore been pensioned at the rate of \$30 per month.

It is true that this legislation confers a great benefit upon some thousands of widows who do not at this time receive sufficient pension to subsist properly, or to receive the proper care necessarily required for their comfort at this age.

The committee report states that indications shows that many of these widows are helpless and sadly in need of this assistance. There are on the pension rolls of the Government 206,530 widows of Civil War veterans; these figures are of January, 1928.

The committee has conferred a real favor upon many thousands of these worthy widows in the passage of this bill. However, there remains this positive fact—that the age limit placed in this legislation is entirely too high, in requiring that the

widow be 75 years old before she receives the increase of \$10 per month. It would be more equitable and just if this age limit were 65 or 70 years instead of 75 years. The other branch of Congress feels more generous toward the widows; they have seen fit to favorably report a bill allowing widows of Civil War veterans a pension of \$50 per month.

It is stated that the Government, from July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1927, paid out \$83,763,158.37 for pensions to Civil War widows.

These figures bring to the American people an idea of the enormous cost of war not only in the money spent but entailment in expenditures that must follow in its wake, and in the untold sorrow and suffering which humanity must endure. Is there no solution to this problem? Who has offered a better solution than the great American President and statesman, Woodrow Wilson, in his plan for outlawing war through the League of Nations?

The American people should ponder over the results of war—how our manhood is ravished and the people are saddled with a burden almost unbearable. And yet it is our duty to protect those who have fought for our country—theirs should be a fair and generous reward. And second only to our duty to the veterans themselves, is our duty to provide for the widows.

Mr. PRALL. Mr. Speaker, depending upon our action in the House to-day by passing or rejecting H. R. 10159, providing an increase in Civil War widows' pension allowances from \$30 to \$40 per month, will disclose to those dependents the feeling of gratitude or ingratitude of the citizens of our respective districts. By our attitude to-day we will convey to these dependents a message of appreciation of services well and nobly performed by Civil War veterans during the darkest hours of the Nation's peril. Should we reject this bill it will indicate our indifference, our ingratitude, and our unfriendliness.

By supporting this measure I believe I voice the sympathetic and humane attitude of the voters of my district, who may always be depended upon to give cheerfully and bountifully of their time and funds to espouse a worthy cause. If they could express their opinion, as I will do for them, the vote would be unanimous. They are grateful to all war veterans and not unmindful of the needs of their dependents, and I am sure they feel as I do, that while the Government is spending enormous sums for other purposes, it should provide an adequate pension for Civil War veterans' widows to the end that their declining years might be made as comfortable as possible.

If this bill passes fixing the pension at \$40 per month, it would equal \$1.33 per day. I am reminded that this sum must provide shelter, food, clothing, and medical attention. The question is, how can it be done?

Under the provisions of this bill, in order to receive the increase, these already aged women must have attained the age of 75 years. It would be interesting at this point to know how many of them ever reach that age—certainly not a large number. If the number is not large, by the same token the expense to the Government would be infinitesimal.

During this session the Senate reported a bill providing an increase to \$50 per month. In view of this action taken by the gentlemen at the other end of the Hall it is hard to understand why this committee failed to report a similar bill. Can it be that we Members of the House place the purchasing power of the dollar at a higher point than the gentlemen of the Senate? Or do we fail to comprehend the urgent need of these dependents?

Physical infirmities and illness come to us with greater suffering and frequency at the age of 75 years, and if we are without the wherewithal to meet it, the toll is disastrous.

Mr. Speaker, in the Sixty-ninth Congress the committee reported H. R. 4023 providing an increase to \$50 per month for Civil War widows. In the report submitted at the time it stated that—

the committee considered the bill an emergency measure; that whatever more is to be done for these old soldiers and widows must be done soon. They are fast passing to their reward, where a grateful Nation can do no more to pay the debt it owes to them. To-day the average age of the widows is nearly 75 years.

The last paragraph of that report stated that if the bill became a law, it would probably be the last expression of Congress to pay the debt of gratitude which the Nation owed these old veterans and their dependents; that in view of the rapidly decreasing numbers, the increase granted them by H. R. 4023 would not be a burden on the Treasury for long.

But the case was more succinctly stated to-day by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. UNDERWOOD] when he said:

The present system of increasing widows' pensions by private pension bills is discriminatory, unfair, and unjust. As a result of this system

a few widows, by the activities of their Representatives in Congress, secure a pension allowance of \$50 per month, while the great majority of widows are denied this relief and are compelled to get along on \$30 per month. Manifestly it is unfair giving a few thousand widows \$50 per month by private pension bills and denying that allowance to thousands of other widows who are equally aged, equally infirm, equally indigent, and equally deserving. All are practically on the same basis in reference to age, health, and financial condition. All should be treated alike.

Congress should not disregard this state of affairs. There should not be two separate pension laws for war widows. There should be no discrimination, especially by legislative acts. These cases are practically identical and should be so considered. Congress should no longer withhold the increase to all dependents that is now enjoyed by a fortunate few. Fifty dollars per month would meet the requirements more adequately than \$40 would.

Congress may, and I hope will, in the near future take cognizance of this inequality and end the discrimination by passing a general law equalizing pension allowances to all dependents as a result of all wars.

Huge sums are appropriated annually to meet the requirements of governmental activities. The people of the Nation are not always in complete agreement as to the wisdom of or the necessity for many of these vast expenditures. I am sure, however, by providing adequate pensions for the dependents of American veterans of all wars, who have passed into the great beyond, American citizens, whom we represent in this House, will not only be in accord with, but will applaud our action for passing this bill.

Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I do not like the provisions in this bill, H. R. 10159. I think it is most unjust and unfair of this House to grant these aged, worthy widows of the Civil War a miserly increase of \$10 a month.

I understand the Senate Pension Committee has reported out a bill to increase these pensions from \$30 to \$50 a month. I am disappointed in the House that it does not agree with the Senate, and it only means a conference and I hope a victory for the Senate.

In the last Congress a pension bill passed increasing the pensions of widows of the Civil War from \$30 to \$40 a month, and what happened to it? It was "pocket vetoed" by the President in the closing days of the Congress. Will this bill meet with the same fate? What assurance have you that the President will at this time approve this bill?

In the beginning of the Seventieth Congress I informed the widows of the Civil War veterans in the twelfth district of New Jersey, whom I have the honor to represent, that I would file special bills for each and every one, requesting an increase in their pension to \$50 a month. I have already filed some 27 special pension bills. I did this because of the fact that last year I introduced four special bills and intended to introduce more, but was advised by the Committee on Invalid Pensions that they intended to have a general pension bill passed, and to go along with the "economy program" of this administration. I accepted the advice of the committee and refrained from giving any additional work to the clerks of this important committee. What was the result? The four special bills I introduced were passed by Congress and approved by the President, giving four widows in my district \$50 a month pension. It was not my intention to be partial to these widows, no matter how worthy they may be. How very unfair to the other equally worthy widows of Jersey City and elsewhere? Even had the President approved the general bill—I believe it was known as the Elliot bill, H. R. 4023—those four widows, by special legislation, were even then receiving an increase of \$10 a month more than the remaining widows.

To justify myself I introduced a special bill, as I have previously stated, in this Congress for every widow of the Civil War in my district whose case was called to my attention. I am told there are 6,500 special bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and this bill to-day is the solution of the problem. I do not like the solution. It should have been \$50 a month and not a dollar less.

Furthermore, I do not like the age limit, 75 years, before the widow may receive this increase in pension. Many of the bills I have introduced are for widows in the late sixties or early seventies and they would not come under this bill, yet are helpless and need almost constant care. I believe the age limit should be stricken out and let all those widows now on the pension roll be eligible for this increase as soon as the bill becomes a law.

Another unjust provision in this bill is the fixed date of marriage to the veteran, 1905. I think any widow who had been married previous to 1915 should come under this law. The

Elliot bill included this recommendation, I believe, and it was a far more liberal bill than the one now considered.

I do not believe that the Members of the House are rising to the emergency. This probably will be the last act we will be able to perform for these aged widows of the Civil War and why not be more generous?

My hope rests with the Senate, that this august body will not be blinded by economy, but will see the light of truth, justice, and reward.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill provides for an increase in pension for widows of Civil War veterans now receiving \$30 a month to \$40 a month, provided they have attained the age of 75 years.

The bill can not be amended, a motion to recommit is not in order, and the debate is limited to a few minutes. It is another case of accept what is offered or vote against the bill. To defeat the bill would deprive a few widows of a \$10 increase in pension, and nothing would be gained by such a vote.

If the opportunity was afforded for amendment, or even a motion to recommit, every Civil War widow would receive a pension of \$50 a month, because there are not a handful of men in this House who would be willing to be recorded against such a provision.

The action of the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions in calling up this bill under suspension of the rules convinces me the House will not have an opportunity to consider any measure at this session, and Members given the right to offer amendments, if the bill provides additional benefits to veterans of any war or their widows, or seeks in any way to amend the pension laws or veterans' act.

Just a few minutes ago under similar conditions we were required to vote for a bill as reported extending the time for filing applications for adjusted compensation, commonly called bonus.

I would estimate that not less than 50 Members of the House at this session have introduced bills which, if enacted, would make the adjusted compensation law more equitable and just, but under the procedure no one could offer an amendment to the bill just passed.

I introduced a bill providing that if the man died within the time allowed by law to file an application and failed to do so, his wife, children, or dependent father or mother could file an application and be paid upon the same basis as though the man had filed himself.

Another amendment suggested would have enabled the wife, child, dependent father or mother to have received, not one-third, as they did receive if their relative had been killed in action, but the full amount of the adjusted service certificate. As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROWNING] said, these glaring discriminations puts a penalty on a man because he was either killed in action or died before he had an opportunity under the law to make his application. There is not one man in the House who would have voted against this bill if the two amendments referred to had been offered and adopted.

While this is a glaring discrimination, the provision in the bill granting increases in pensions to widows of Civil War veterans, provided they have reached the age of 75 years, is likewise a glaring discrimination.

The law provides that any widow of a Civil War veteran who served 90 days or more and was honorably discharged is entitled to a pension, provided she married the veteran prior to June 27, 1905. Let me cite as an example of discrimination the case of a widow who at the age of 20 years married a Civil War veteran. She lived with him for over 50 years, nursed him in the closing days of his life. She has now reached the age of say, 71, 72, or 73 years. This widow, who lived with the veteran over 50 years, is not entitled to the increase. On the other hand, take a widow who married the soldier in 1904, when the average age of Civil War veterans was nearly 60 years, who was 52 or more years of age at the time of the marriage, she is entitled to an additional \$10 a month.

The 75-year age limit discriminates against the young girl who married the soldier immediately after the war and who lived with him, raised the children, and cared for him in his declining years.

I sincerely hope the Senate will not only strike out this age limitation but will also raise the amount a Civil War widow shall receive in the future to \$50 a month.

The country owes it to the veterans of the various wars, as well as to their widows, to assist them, if they were disabled or in their declining years, and I, for one, do not want to see economy at the expense of our veterans, no matter what war they might have served in.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, this bill (H. R. 10159) provides for an increase of pensions at the rate of \$40 per month

for widows of honorably discharged soldiers of the Civil War who served 90 days or more or who incurred disability in the line of duty, without regard to length of service, who were married to the soldier prior to June 27, 1905, and who are now or who may attain the age of 75 years.

This bill comes up under a motion to suspend the rules, and no amendment can, therefore, be offered to it, and we are compelled to vote for it as a whole without amendment or to vote against it.

I am going to support the bill for two reasons. First, I favor this increase, because I believe it is just and because under existing law any widow who married and lived with an honorably discharged soldier during the time of his service now receives a minimum pension of \$50 per month. I think there should be no discrimination against any of these widows and that all should receive \$50 per month. I am not, under the rules, permitted to offer an amendment to that effect, and while this bill only gives \$40 per month, it is \$10 per month more than they are now receiving, and I am going to vote for it for that reason.

In the second place, this bill goes to the Senate for consideration, and it is my hope that the Senate will amend the bill, increasing the rate to \$50 per month, so that no discrimination may be made against any of these widows, and in that event if the bill comes back to the House with such an amendment I will be glad to give it my support and we may then get an opportunity to vote for such an amendment.

The Interior Department appropriation bill, now pending in conference, as it passed the House appropriated \$210,000,000 for pensions. On June 30, 1927, there were 489,942 pensioners and of these 236,300 were widows, 2,321 minor children, 899 helpless children, 4,211 dependent fathers and mothers. In addition, there were 17 widows of the War of 1812 and 6 survivors of the War with Mexico.

The following table shows the amount paid to pensioners from the beginning of the Government to the end of the fiscal year 1927:

War of the Revolution	\$70,000,000.00
War of 1812	46,172,521.05
Indian wars	31,513,894.62
War with Mexico	58,056,020.69
Civil War	6,951,413,812.70
War with Spain	239,227,907.53
Regular Establishment	78,381,522.64
World War	219,966.55
Unclassified	16,513,425.54
Total	7,491,499,071.32

The soldiers of the Civil War and their widows are decreasing in number very rapidly through death. During the past year 16,958 Civil War soldiers and 20,828 Civil War widows died.

I would welcome legislation which would give all of these widows of honorably discharged soldiers the same compensation, \$50 per month, and if an opportunity is afforded I will vote for any amendment that will give them that amount and make no discrimination against any of them.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that the majority of the Committee on Invalid Pensions felt constrained because of a possible false sense of economy to dissent from their more generous attitude of two years ago, when the committee reported, and the House passed, the general pension bill, carrying a pension of \$50 a month to all Civil War widows who were married to the veterans prior to June 27, 1915. And since it was understood that this action on the part of the House was not in contravention of President Coolidge's economy plan, it is safe to assume that it is not out of harmony with the financial program to-day. Each month the number of these worthy, aged women, these soldiers of the home, these fireside nurses and comforters who have so faithfully stood by the soldiers of the war through all the vicissitudes of life, is becoming less and less, so that in no way can it be considered that allowing them even so small a pension as \$50, much less \$40, a month will the country suffer any great inroads on its exchequer. I am very loath to agree with this attitude on the part of the House, and sincerely trust that we shall be at least as generous as the Senate committee has been in reporting their bill with a \$50 provision for these women who have reached the age where a little comfort and care are so much needed and so much appreciated. Surely we all know in these times of high prices for all the necessities of human existence that \$40 will provide only the most humble and meager means. Let us give these wives and mothers of our country a livable pension; let it not be said that we are a forgetful people, a people who are so engrossed with our selfish accomplishments that we pass by on the other side and leave our neighbor to suffer for the want of the least human needs and comforts. Let us not "do

the many things we ought not to have done and leave undone the things we ought to have done."

Mr. UPDIKE. Mr. Speaker, to-day we have passed House bill 10159. This bill provides an increase of pension to widows and former widows of certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War. The bill provides an increase from \$30 a month to \$40 a month. The widow must have been married to the soldier, sailor, or marine prior to the 27th day of June, 1905, and reached the age of 75 years. Of course this bill will benefit thousands of widows, but I am against the policy of bringing soldier legislation before the House under suspension of the rules. We are only allowed 20 minutes' debate for those in favor of the bill and 20 minutes for those opposed. No amendments can be offered, and could not be considered if offered.

In the Sixty-ninth Congress we increased certain widows of Civil War veterans. It applied, however, to those widows who were married prior or during the Civil War period. The Invalid Pension Committee of the House reported favorably a bill increasing all widows' pensions to \$50, but the bill was amended in the Senate to apply only to those widows who were married prior or during the Civil War period. I am in favor of increasing all widows' pensions to \$50, and if the Members of this House were given an opportunity to vote on such a measure it would pass the House by a large majority. I believe this great Government can and should provide for those widows who are old and feeble and unable to work and earn a living. It seems to me that we should not hesitate to provide for those who gave up the best part of their lives to care for those gallant soldiers who fought for their country.

According to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions, in January, 1928, there were 206,530 widows of Civil War veterans on the pension rolls of the Government. The report further discloses that from July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1927, the Government paid out \$83,763,158.37 for pensions to Civil War widows. With the present mortality rate of 11,000 a year, it is reasonable to presume that the death rate will increase from year to year. I desire to provide for them while they are living and not wait until they are gone to raise their pension. We should provide for their peace and happiness now.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the pending measure does not provide an allowance of \$50 per month for all widows of Civil War veterans who are entitled to pensions. Only a few of these widows are still living and practically all of them are quite old, infirm, and without means of support. Many of them are blind, confined to their rooms or bed, or otherwise helpless. They are absolutely incapable of earning a livelihood, and many of them are destitute and require the constant care of a nurse or attendant. The long-established policy of our Government is to make provision for the comfortable maintenance of these aged women, and no one will contend that \$30 per month will provide for the decent support of these widows.

As a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions I supported an amendment to this bill to make the monthly allowance \$50, and every other Democrat on the committee wholeheartedly supported this amendment. For reasons best known to themselves our Republican colleagues on the committee saw fit not to join with us in reporting out this bill increasing widows' pensions to \$50 per month. Moreover, the majority of the committee went further and wrote into the bill a provision denying this \$10 increase to all widows who have not attained the age of 75 years. I opposed this provision for reasons which are perfectly obvious to everyone familiar with the facts in relation to the needs of these widows, without regard to their ages.

At the time the House Committee on Invalid Pensions was engaged in the task of emasculating this bill the Senate Committee on Pensions reported out a bill granting an allowance of \$50 per month to all widows of Civil War veterans who are entitled to pensions under the general law. This indicates that the Senate looks with favor on an allowance of \$50 per month to these widows, and if the House and the President had only gone along with the Senate undoubtedly the \$50 proposal would have become a law. The sentiment of the Members of the House is overwhelmingly in favor of this increase, and if this bill had been allowed to come before the House for consideration as bills are generally considered it could and would have been amended by substituting \$50 for \$40 as the monthly pension allowance to the widows of Civil War veterans.

But no, "the powers that be" brought this bill before the House on a motion to suspend the rules, which meant that the bill could not be amended and would have to be "voted up or voted down." In other words, those in charge of the bill, by calling up the bill on a motion to suspend the rules, in a parliamentary sense, "bound and gagged" those who favored a more liberal allowance and prevented the bill from being amended in any way whatsoever. In this manner the majority

party worked its will, although there would have been practically no votes in the House against increasing this allowance to \$50 per month.

Therefore the responsibility for this denial of justice to the aged and infirm widows of Civil War veterans must and does rest squarely on the Republican leaders in the House. Not one of them will say that \$50 per month is too much for these aged women who are dying at the rate of more than 1,000 each month. The only excuse I have heard urged by my Republican friends is that the President would veto a bill increasing widows' pensions to \$50 per month. If Congress had passed this bill granting the \$50 allowance and put the proposition up to the President I do not think that he would have vetoed the bill. But if the bill met with a veto, the responsibility would have been on the President and not on Congress.

Under our form of government it is the duty of Congress to enact such legislation as the Members may consider just and proper. We should do our duty as we see it without regard to the views of the President. After Congress has enacted legislation, the President has the right and power to approve or disapprove such legislation.

I believe this increase from \$30 to \$50 should be granted for at least two reasons: In the first place \$30 is not an adequate allowance under present conditions and high cost of living; in the second place, this increase should be granted and a uniform allowance established in order to prevent unjust, inexcusable, and unreasonable discrimination between widows who are equally deserving, equally aged, equally infirm, and equally destitute. We should not "make fish of one and fowl of another." We should not grant increases to some widows and deny that increase to other widows whose claims are just as meritorious.

The calendars of the House and Senate are crowded with private bills to increase the pension allowance of certain widows from \$30 to \$50 per month. I have introduced numerous bills of this character and endeavored to secure their enactment. I never secured the enactment of a private pension bill that was not meritorious. But I want to call your attention to the discrimination and social injustice that is being accomplished under the present system of granting increases of pensions to certain widows by private acts. Take a little township, say, 6 miles square—any one of the many thousand similar townships throughout the Nation. In this township live five or six widows, each of whom under the general law is drawing a pension of \$30 per month. One of these widows has a friend at court—one of these widows learns that there is a method by which her Congressman or her Senator can secure an increase of her pension to \$50 per month. She gets into communication with her Congressman or Senator and he introduces a bill to grant her a \$20 increase in her monthly pension allowance. Under the advice of her Senator or Representative she submits affidavits in support of this private bill. A favorable committee report is secured and this private bill is included in an omnibus bill that is enacted by Congress and approved by the President. This omnibus bill increases the pension allowance of a few hundred widows but grants no similar allowance to the many thousand other widows who are equally aged, destitute, and deserving. This one widow is shown favoritism over the four or five other widows in her township who have just as strong claims on the bounty of the Government as the widow who is given an increase by a private act. Under this system one widow in a community gets \$50 per month while four or five other widows in that community who are just as old, just as infirm, just as destitute, and just as deserving must be satisfied with only \$30.

Now, I am opposed to this discrimination. The monthly allowance to widows of Civil War veterans should be increased to \$50, because that amount is none too liberal and is necessary to furnish these old women a decent living; and this increase is necessary in order to prevent social injustice and discrimination between widows who are equally deserving and equally in need of the Nation's bounty.

By granting this increase and establishing a flat or uniform rate for each and every widow we will be treating them all alike, prevent discrimination, and at the same time relieve the calendars of the Senate and House of thousands of private pension bills, only a small portion of which can be considered at any one session of Congress. By granting this increase we will place all widows on an equality, relieve Congress of the burden of enacting private pension bills, and do justice to all widows of veterans without showing partiality or favoritism to any. If this is done, only in very exceptional cases would it be necessary to introduce a private pension bill.

I call your attention to the fact that the House Committee on Invalid Pensions as far back as April, 1926, unanimously

reported a bill increasing the pension allowance of widows of Civil War veterans to \$50 per month, and that report urged that whatever is to be done for these widows "must be done soon." I assert that after the lapse of two years this emergency has been accentuated, and there is stronger reason than ever for this increase. If this increase was necessary two years ago, I would like to inquire by what process of reasoning the majority of the committee now recommends that the monthly allowance be limited to \$40. I am also curious to learn why the Republican leadership in the House arbitrarily blocks this legislation, which is admittedly just and necessary.

But, Mr. Speaker, as we are denied the poor privilege of voting for an allowance of \$50 per month to widows of Civil War veterans, and as we are, in effect, told that we must take \$10 per month increase or nothing, I am voting for the \$40 per month allowance, not because I think that amount sufficient but because our good Republican friends tell us frankly that if we do not accept the \$40 allowance we will get no increase whatsoever at this session. I hope the Senate will correct this blunder and amend this bill so as to carry an allowance of \$50 per month for these aged, infirm, and helpless widows.

Mr. CRAIL. Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record now, which is the first opportunity I have had in Congress, as being in favor of liberal pensions for veterans, their widows, and their dependents.

The widows of Civil War veterans have not been generously provided for by this most generous of all nations. Every widow of a Civil War veteran who is entitled to a pension should have not less than \$50 per month.

The bill which is before the House at this time (H. R. 10159) is inadequate and is not a credit to the Congress or to the American people. It increases the pensions of widows of the Civil War from \$30 to \$40 per month, provided that they have reached the age of 75 years or more, and provided that they were married to their veteran husbands prior to June 27, 1905.

If I am correctly advised, this will benefit only an inconsiderable number of widows and the increased financial burden on the Government is almost negligible. The bill does not meet the situation at all. The emergency which exists is calling for immediate action and relief rather than a mere friendly gesture. This Government of ours can well afford to be just and generous, even liberal, toward the widows of those who bore the burden of the battle in the hour of our country's direst need.

With the high cost of living at the present time and the depreciated purchasing value of the dollar, \$50 would not be the equivalent of \$25, 15 years ago. Thirty dollars, which practically all of the widows of Civil War veterans are now receiving and which they will continue to receive if this bill is enacted into law, is wholly inadequate to live on. Surely an old woman can not live in any comfort or peace on \$30 per month.

I understand, of course, that this bill is now before the House for consideration under a suspension of the rules, and that for that reason amendments to the bill are not in order and can not be considered. Therefore we must either vote for the bill as it is or vote against it. We can not change it.

I am not criticizing the Committee on Invalid Pensions which reported out this bill, nor would I presume to criticize or condemn any member of the committee or any Member of this Congress because of the bill. I know of the difficulties with which the committee has had to deal. I know that the committee is acting in good faith and with the thought that it is doing the very best thing possible under the circumstances, and that this small increase is the most that they can hope will become a law. I can not agree with the committee in this, and I claim the right of expressing my opinion as to what would be wise and as to what would be just in the matter.

If I am correctly informed this House has on two previous occasions passed bills granting a pension of \$50 per month to widows of Civil War veterans. These bills, though passed by the House, were not enacted into law. Perhaps because of this fact the committee has brought in this bill in the hope that with this small increase it will become a law and that one-tenth of a loaf is better than no loaf. I firmly believe that the committee would like to report and have passed a bill increasing widows' pensions to \$50 per month.

I understand that the Senate at this session has passed a bill providing a pension of \$50 per month for widows of the Civil War. I would be very much in favor of this House concurring with the Senate in such action and trusting the fate of the bill to the generous impulses of the very able, the much-revered, and the high-minded patriot into whose hands it would then come. We would have done our duty, and if that bill did not become a law there would yet be time to pass this bill at this session.

Before a widow of a Civil War veteran can benefit by the passage of this bill she must be at least five years beyond the allotted three score years and ten. Many thousands of them will never live to enjoy any benefit from this bill and many more thousands of them who do live until they are 75 years of age will not live to enjoy for any length of time the increased pension granted by this bill. Seventy-five years is a ripe old age.

I call to mind a case where a young girl in her early twenties married a Civil War veteran more than 40 years ago. For almost 40 years she was a good wife to this old veteran of the Civil War and during the last 10 years of his life she nursed and cared for him as a loving mother would for her helpless child. The veteran has now passed on to his great reward but his widow, who has herself been stricken, largely because of her unselfish and loyal devotion to her veteran husband and is now practically helpless, will have to live another 15 years in comparative poverty under the terms of this bill, until her pension is increased \$10 per month. Her pension should not be less than \$50 per month right now. There are many such cases.

I call to mind another case within my personal knowledge where a good woman married a veteran of the Civil War in 1906 and actually lived with him as a good and devoted wife for more than 20 years. She is now a widow but can not draw a pension because she was not married to her veteran husband six months earlier than she was.

If amendments to this bill were in order I would like to offer an amendment to the effect that any widow who for 10 years has lived with and cared for a husband who was a veteran of the Civil War would be entitled to a pension of \$50 per month.

As the bill now stands if a woman married a veteran of the Civil War prior to 1905 and lived with him one year or only two weeks she is entitled to a pension. I think this is discriminatory and inequitable; I think the pensionable status should not be fixed by date of marriage but by the length of service and the comradeship and the devotion she has rendered to her veteran husband. If an arbitrary date must be fixed, it should be moved back at least 10 years to 1915 instead of 1905.

It has been my observation that the wives of veterans of the Civil War are devoted to their husbands; that they take good care of them, and are worthy and deserving of the generosity of a Nation, which is grateful to the men, who risked their all for their country during its most critical hour.

The Bureau of Pensions has reported that 11,000 widows of Civil War veterans die each year, and that 1,569 of them died during the month of December, 1927. The vast majority of the surviving widows will soon have passed away, and the amount which it would take to increase their pensions to \$50 per month, would never be felt by this great and almost unbelievably rich Nation. Many of them are helpless and in need of constant care and attention. Thirty dollars per month which most of them receive or \$40 per month, which a few of them will receive under the terms of this bill, will not go far toward supporting an old woman, who is helpless or who needs the constant care and attention of another person.

To those who think that the cost to the Government of a pension of \$50 per month to widows, would be considerable or would be felt by the Government, I say that it is not a matter of cost. It is a matter of obligation. It is an obligation which this Government assumed when the Civil War veterans were enlisted and sent to battle for their country. It is an obligation which this Government has never hesitated to acknowledge.

The people of this country expect their Congress to meet that obligation in the same generous and gallant spirit in which the dead husbands of these widows took up arms in defense of the Union.

To those who think that the cost is a matter of calculation, I would say, let the cost be considered when next an effort is made to plunge our country into war, for as surely as our country is plunged into war it becomes the duty of our country to care for and provide for the casualties of that war, the men who are disabled in that war, their widows, and their orphans.

I am going to vote for the bill because it does increase the pensions of some of these deserving widows, but I can not do so without giving clear expression to my thought that it is inadequate; that it does not meet the emergency that exists; that it is a mere excuse for a failure of more generous action.

It is my fond hope that before this session of Congress closes it will be my privilege, as it would be the privilege of a great majority of the Members of this House, to vote for a bill which will give to widows of veterans of the Civil War, a pension of not less than \$50 per month. I now declare that I will cheer-

fully and heartily cooperate with other Members of this House of a similar mind to that end.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include the following:

A few days ago a bill passed the House of Representatives to increase the pensions of the widows of the Civil War veterans from \$30 to \$40 a month. I know this small increase will be a great disappointment to the worthy women who ministered so faithfully to those loyal men who came to the rescue of their country in her time of need. Many of these veterans were sick and helpless for years before they passed away and these wives were faithful to the end and now, when they are aged and infirm, and their years are numbered, it seems to me the least we can do is to give them a pension large enough to provide at least the comforts, and perhaps a few luxuries, and an increase of \$10 a month above what they are now receiving will not add much to their income.

I am in favor of at least \$50 a month and with no age limit. Many of these widows married their soldier husbands when they were very young girls and have not attained the age of 75, yet they spent many years making a home, performing the duties of wife and mother, and in every way giving the best there was in them to carry on the partnership which they hoped would end in peace and comfort. Sickness, misfortune, and other unexpected things, prevented the saving for a rainy day and now, when these wives and mothers are too old to go out and make a living for themselves, they should not have to worry about where they are to secure a means to subsist the rest of their days. I am in favor of giving every Civil War widow now on the pension rolls \$50 a month, without regard to age or date of marriage.

I understand the Senate has reported out a bill to increase these pensions from \$30 to \$50 a month and I trust, when it comes to conference, the House will agree to the increase to \$50, as even that is small enough at best.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10151) to amend section 9 of the Federal reserve act.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. What is this about?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my colleague that this is a bill which will permit State banks and trust companies to act as depositories of public money provided they give the same bond as is required of national banks, and provided also they are members of the Federal reserve system.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the Federal reserve act be amended by adding thereto a new paragraph as follows:

"All banks or trust companies incorporated by special law or organized under the general laws of any State which are members of the Federal reserve system, when designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be depositories of public money, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and they may also be employed as financial agents of the Government; and they shall perform all such reasonable duties, as depositories of public money and financial agents of the Government, as may be required of them. The Secretary of the Treasury shall require of the banks and trust companies thus designated satisfactory security, by the deposit of United States bonds or otherwise, for the safe keeping and prompt payment of the public money deposited with them and for the faithful performance of their duties as financial agents of the Government."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

JURISDICTION OVER LANDS IN NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1959) to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy jurisdiction over oil and gas leases issued by the Secretary of the Interior on lands in naval petroleum reserves.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection of the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction over and the administration and enforcement of all oil and gas leases on lands in naval petroleum reserves issued pursuant to the provisions of section 18 and section 18 (a) of the act approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 437), entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Navy.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MUNICIPAL AVIATION FIELD, YUMA, ARIZ.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1154) to authorize the use by the county of Yuma, Ariz., of certain public lands for a municipal aviation field, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, subject to valid existing rights, be, and he is hereby, authorized to lease to the county of Yuma, Ariz., for the establishment and maintenance of a municipal aviation field, the east half of section 10 and the west half of section 11 in township 9 south, of range 23 west, of the Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Yuma County, Ariz., containing 640 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. That said lease shall be for a period of 20 years, and be subject to renewal for a like period, on condition that the county pay to the United States a rental of \$1 per year for the use of the said land: *Provided,* That Government departments and agencies operating aircraft shall always have free and unrestricted use of said field and the right to erect and install upon said land such structures and improvements as the heads of such departments and agencies may deem advisable, including facilities for maintaining supplies of fuel, oil, and other materials for operating aircraft, and that in case of emergency, or in event it shall be deemed advisable, the Government of the United States may assume absolute control of the management and operation of said field for military purposes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8284) to authorize the payment of amounts appropriated by the Legislature of Alaska on account of additional duties imposed upon Territorial officers.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. SCHAFER. I will withhold it; yes.

Mr. HOOPER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LANGRISH] had to go to New York on some important business, and he asked me to have this bill passed over without prejudice. I am not asking this for myself, but I would like the gentleman, if he can accommodate the gentleman from New York to that extent, to withhold his objection and let the bill be passed over without prejudice until he returns.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Territories, which reported this bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SALE OF UNDISPOSED LOTS, ST. MARKS, FLA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9842) to provide for the survey, appraisal, and sale of the undisposed lots in the town site of St. Marks, Fla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior may cause all public lands within the Government town site of St. Marks, situated in sections 2, 3, 10, and 11, township 4 south, range 1 east, Tallahassee meridian, Florida, established by the act of March 2, 1833 (4 Stat.

664), to be surveyed into lots, blocks, streets, and alleys as he may deem proper and when the survey is completed cause said lots to be appraised by three competent and disinterested persons appointed by him and report their proceedings to him for action thereon. If such appraisement be disapproved the Secretary of the Interior shall again cause the said lands to be appraised as before provided; and when the appraisal has been approved he shall cause the said lots to be sold at public sale to the highest bidder for cash at not less than the appraised value thereof, first having given 60 days' public notice of the time, place, and terms of the sale immediately prior thereto by publication in at least one newspaper having a general circulation in the vicinity of the land and in such other newspapers as he may deem advisable; and any lots remaining unsold may be reoffered for sale at any subsequent time in the same manner at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, and if not sold at such second offering for want of bidders, then the Secretary of the Interior may sell the same at private sale for cash at not less than the appraised value thereof: *Provided*, That the square embracing the lands now being used as a burying ground be set aside as a cemetery for the use of the town of St. Marks, Fla.: *Provided further*, That the municipality of St. Marks, Fla., shall have a right for 90 days subsequent to the acceptance of the plat of survey of said land to select and receive patent to any block desired for a public park, not exceeding 5 acres in area.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, beginning in line 21, after the word "Florida" strike out the proviso ending in line 25, and insert: "*Provided further*, That the municipality of St. Marks, Fla., shall have a right for 90 days subsequent to the filing of the plat of survey of said town site to select and receive patent to any two blocks desired for public-park purposes, not exceeding 5.5 acres in area.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SUBMARINE ACCIDENTS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10437), granting double pension in all cases where an officer or enlisted man of the Navy dies or is disabled in line of duty as the result of a submarine accident.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter in all cases when an officer or enlisted man of the United States Navy has died or shall die as the result of an accident to a submarine vessel, said officer or enlisted man having been employed in duty on or in handling the submarine at the time of such accident the amount of pension to be paid the widow or dependents of such officer or enlisted man shall be double the amount of that authorized to be paid under existing pension laws should death have occurred by reason of an injury received in service in line of duty, not the result of a submarine accident: *Provided, however*, That in any event the widow shall be paid a pension of not less than \$30 per month and \$6 per month additional for each child under 18 years of age of the officer or enlisted man, and in the event of death or remarriage of the widow or forfeiture of title by her, or if no widow survives the officer or enlisted man, the rate of pension herein provided for a widow shall be paid to the minor children under 18 years of age of such officer or enlisted man, from the date of such death or remarriage of the widow or forfeiture of her title and in other cases from the date of the death of the officer or enlisted man.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, in line 10, after the word "minor," insert the words "child or."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

GOLD-STAR MOTHERS

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] may be allowed to extend her remarks on the subject of the gold-star mothers' bill passed to-day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it does not need any words of mine to impress upon this Congress the one great

duty to be performed, toward the heroic dead of the Nation who fell in the World War.

That duty is to provide transportation for American war mothers to visit the graves of their beloved sons, wherever they fell. By the passage of H. R. 5494 this sacred pilgrimage will be accomplished; and to fully realize what this means to such a mother, is only to read the letter of Mrs. Mathilda S. Burling, national representative of the Gold Star Mothers Association of America. This letter had such an effect on the Committee on Military Affairs that the bill was reported out unanimously at the first hearing on this bill. I feel sure it had the same effect on every Member of Congress, as they read the report of the committee.

Of the 77,771 who died in the American Expeditionary Forces, I am informed 30,812 bodies remain in Europe, buried in American cemeteries, which are maintained by the United States War Department.

The country which received such a sacrifice can not do less than send their mothers over the sea to pay their last tribute to the boys who never came back to them.

A pilgrimage to these hallowed shrines by 20,000 American gold-star mothers would be one of the most solemn and impressive events in our history. The expedition would be a mighty crusade for international peace.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, on these Consent Calendar days there should be some point at which every Member may be sure the House will stop. We could not finish this calendar to-day if we continued to an unreasonable hour. It seems to me that 5 o'clock is the proper point at which to stop in order to be fair to all. If we follow this plan every Member will know that when the hour of 5 o'clock is reached we are going to adjourn. If this is done no one will be specially favored or discriminated against.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. There are a number of bridge bills on this calendar. They are all in the regular form prescribed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Does the gentleman think it possible in a day or so to get permission to have those bridge bills considered, because we are very anxious to get them through and over to the Senate. There are no objections to those bridge bills.

Mr. TILSON. It has been the practice of the House in the past, when an emergency exists in regard to a bridge, to consider such bills on a day other than consent day, but to-day it seems to me that having reached the hour of 5 o'clock we ought to adjourn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MAPES), for two days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. SOMERS of New York, for two weeks, on account of illness.

To Mr. WAINWRIGHT, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. WRIGHT (at the request of Mr. CRISP), for four days, on account of death in his family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 7032. An act authorizing the Valley Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Canton, Ky.;

H. R. 7033. An act authorizing the Valley Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Iuka, Ky.;

H. R. 7034. An act authorizing the Midland Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Smithland, Ky.;

H. R. 7035. An act authorizing the Midland Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the mouth of Clarks River;

H. R. 7036. An act authorizing the Valley Bridge Co. (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, main-

tain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Eggners Ferry, Ky.; and

H. R. 8216. An act to confer authority on the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia to permit J. L. Sink, a bankrupt, to file his application for discharge and to authorize and empower the judge of said court to hear and determine the same.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 21, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Tuesday, February 21, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10 a. m.)

Navy Department appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

To establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce (H. R. 7940).

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

(10.30 a. m.)

For the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Fourteenth Census (H. R. 27).

For the apportionment of Representatives in Congress (H. R. 130).

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend the immigration act of 1924 by making the quota provisions thereof applicable to Mexico, Cuba, Canada, and the countries of continental America and adjacent islands (H. R. 6465).

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

(10 a. m.)

To amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented (H. R. 358, 383, 5518, 7343, and 8832).

To amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and authorizing appropriation of \$150,000,000 per annum for two years (H. R. 7019).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

368. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1929, amounting to \$50,000, of which amount \$10,000 shall be immediately available to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to complete an experiment in the grading of meats under standards fixed by the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 179); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

369. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation amounting to \$50,000 for the fiscal year 1929, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct certain tests and experiments looking to the control of the cattle grub (H. Doc. No. 180); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

370. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a bill for the relief of Frans Jan Wouters, Antwerp, Belgium; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

371. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation under the legislative establishment for the fiscal year 1929, in the sum of \$323,000 (H. Doc. No. 181); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10944. A bill for the relief of certain newspapers for

advertising services rendered the Public Health Service of the Treasury Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 710). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9710. A bill for the relief of the State of South Carolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 11140. A bill to provide for the inspection of the battle field of Kings Mountain, S. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WRIGHT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10714. A bill for the relief of T. Abraham Hetrick; without amendment (Rept. No. 707). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUDSPETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3029. A bill for the relief of Vern E. Townsend; with amendment (Rept. No. 708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1529. A bill for the relief of the heirs of John Elmer; with amendment (Rept. No. 709). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 43. An act for the relief of Frederick N. Carr; without amendment (Rept. No. 713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 46. An act for the relief of Daniel F. Roberts; without amendment (Rept. No. 714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 138. An act for the relief of Thomas Johnsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1771. An act for the relief of Peter S. Kelly; without amendment (Rept. No. 716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8508) granting a pension to Frances Jackson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9465) granting a pension to Martha Hutson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIGHAM: A bill (H. R. 11188) to provide for the transfer to the Department of Labor of certain forfeited vessels and vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 11189) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Calif.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FURLOW: A bill (H. R. 11190) to authorize the establishment of Lindbergh Field in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER of New York: A bill (H. R. 11191) to amend an act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 11192) to establish two United States narcotic farms for the confinement and treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming narcotic drugs who have been convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 11193) placing certain employees of the Bureau of Prohibition in the classified civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 11194) to establish a fish hatchery and fish cultural station in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BERGER: A bill (H. R. 11195) to repeal the espionage act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 11196) for the erection of tablets or markers at Camp Blount, Lincoln County, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 11197) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant rights of way to the Vicksburg Bridge & Terminal Co., upon, over, and across the Vicksburg National Military Park at Vicksburg, Warren County, Miss.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARKE: A bill (H. R. 11198) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 7, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 11199) to provide for the furnishing of bonds by national and State banks and trust companies which are members of the Federal reserve system for the protection of depositors; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 11200) donating to the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society two dedication stones formerly a part of one of the locks of the Ohio & Erie Canal; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 11201) to amend section 13 of the interstate commerce act to provide for cooperation between the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, in respect of rates, charges, and practices affecting transportation between points in the United States and points in Canada; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 11202) to authorize the leasing of the floating dry dock at the naval station, New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 11203) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Telfair and Coffee to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Ocmulgee River between a point at or near lands owned by Duncan McLean in Coffee County and a point at or near the northern terminus of the present Jacksonville Ferry in Telfair County, said bridge to be at or near said ferry on a public road to be constructed from McRae, in Telfair County, to Broxton and Douglas, in Coffee County; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 11204) to amend section 24 of the immigration act of 1917, being section 24 of the act of February 5, 1917; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 11205) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain lands in Faulkner County, Ark.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 11206) providing for the establishment of a term of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida at Orlando, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 11207) to enlarge the Army and Navy General Hospital at Hot Springs National Park, Ark.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 11208) providing for engineering and landscape study, preparation of plans, and estimate of cost of improvement of the base and grounds of the Washington Monument in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BURTNESS: A bill (H. R. 11209) to amend section 2 of the Federal highway act; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11210) amending the Federal highway act; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 11211) to authorize the Secretary of War to assume the care, custody, and control of the monument to the memory of the American soldiers who fell in the Battle of New Orleans at Chalmette, La., to maintain the grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 11212) authorizing Paul Leupp, his heirs, legal representatives, or assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Stanton, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 207) authorizing an appropriation for bank protection for the control of floods and the prevention of erosion of the Missouri

River at and near the town of Elk Point in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BEERS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 208) to provide for the printing with illustrations and bound in cloth 130,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 209) to provide for the printing with illustrations and bound in cloth 130,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Horse; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 210) providing for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorating the Battle of Monmouth; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 117) authorizing the United States Bureau of Public Roads to make a survey of the uncompleted bridges of the Oversea Highway from Key West to the mainland in the State of Florida with a view of obtaining the cost of the construction of said bridges and report their findings to Congress; to the Committee on Roads.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. ROGERS: Memorial of the State Assembly of the State of Nevada, signed by the president of the senate, Morley Griswold, and the secretary of the senate, V. Meriardo, and certified by the secretary of state of Nevada, W. G. Greathouse, relative to Federal aid for highway maintenance; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECK of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11213) to reimburse the Vernon County Guernsey Breeders' Association; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 11214) granting a pension to Emma Hofstrand; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11215) for the relief of Harry Hewston; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11216) to correct the military record of James Scott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 11217) granting a pension to Emile Lods; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11218) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11219) granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11220) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Louck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 11221) for the relief of Michael H. Lorden; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11222) granting an increase of pension to Emma Schmolsmire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11223) granting an increase of pension to Eliza F. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11224) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 11225) for the relief of J. C. Levengood; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CLAGUE: A bill (H. R. 11226) granting a pension to James D. Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11227) for the relief of Ora Padgett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11228) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Chard Heritage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 11229) granting a pension to George William Holbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 11230) for the payment to certain citizens of damages because of loss of their property in the general mess building of the Pacific Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers when said building was destroyed by fire on March 24, 1927; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11231) for the relief of Bogustas De Kar-towski; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 11232) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Lansinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 11233) granting a pension to Phoebe Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 11234) granting an increase of pension to Jane Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11235) granting an increase of pension to Lovina A. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 11236) granting an increase of pension to Catharine A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11237) granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Rapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 11238) for the relief of Catherine Panturis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 11239) for the relief of H. W. Dickson and Mary L. Dickson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11240) to correct the military record of James Holder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11241) granting an increase of pension to Frances M. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11242) granting an increase of pension to Olive Held; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 11243) granting a pension to Mary Leffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 11244) granting a pension to Laura V. Crocker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 11245) to cancel certain notes of the Panama Railroad Co. held by the Treasurer of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 11246) granting a pension to Hannah C. Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11247) granting a pension to Sallie A. Giboney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11248) granting a pension to Kinion Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 11249) granting an increase of pension to Julia H. Van Buren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 11250) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Pardue; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11251) granting a pension to William Russell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 11252) granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELVIG: A bill (H. R. 11253) granting an increase of pension to Alvira J. Conner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 11254) granting a pension to Hulbert M. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 11255) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Bruner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 11256) granting an increase of pension to Jennie M. Bond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 11257) for the relief of J. K. Johansen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11258) for the relief of David I. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11259) to authorize the appointment of Staff Sergt. Stephen Miller, retired, United States Army, to master sergeant, retired, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 11260) for the relief of Frans Jan Wouters, of Antwerp, Belgium; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 11261) for the relief of A. O. Gibbens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 11262) to renew and extend certain letters patent to the Reistocrete Co.; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 11263) granting an increase of pension to Richard Howe; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4138. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition from citizens of Crawford County, Ill., urging practical relief for the farmers of the country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4139. By Mr. AYRES: Petition of citizens of Wichita, Kans., in behalf of legislation for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4140. Also, petition of the Southern Kansas Mutual Insurance Co., Wellington, Kans., opposing bills proposing to regulate the manufacture and sale of stamped envelopes by the Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4141. By Mr. BACHMANN: Petition of Harry T. Murphy and 120 other citizens, of Cameron, W. Va., protesting against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4142. By Mr. BOIES: Petition signed by citizens of Sioux City, Woodbury County, Iowa, protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4143. By Mr. BOWMAN: Petition submitted by voters of West Virginia, urging further relief legislation for Civil War veterans and dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4144. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of B. B. Bayless, of River Grove, Ill., in favor of the passage of the Tyson-Fitzgerald bill for the retirement of the disabled emergency Army officers of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4145. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Chas. B. Collier, of Sheridan, Ill., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4146. Also, petition of Walter Ferguson and 23 other citizens of Sheridan, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Lankford Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4147. By Mr. BURTNESS: Resolution passed by Board of County Commissioners of Walsh County, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1752, a bill intending to prevent the Federal Government from selling stamped envelopes with a printed return card thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4148. By Mr. CHAPMAN: Petition of W. R. Lea, W. B. Jordan, F. N. Satterwhite, J. H. Snelling, Homer Riddell, Thomas Maupin, and 31 other citizens of Franklin County, Ky., advocating passage of a bill increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4149. Also, petition of Lillian Johnson, Elbert Warner, Luther Harris, Sheridan Berryman, Alva Puckett, Ray Palmer, and 28 other citizens of Clark and Estill Counties, Ky., protesting against the passage of a compulsory Sunday observance bill, or any other national religious legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4150. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of Rev. Raymond B. Bragg and members and friends of the Church of All Souls, Evanston, Ill., urging furtherance of peace and friendly relations in the adoption of a naval building program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

4151. By Mr. CLAGUE: Petition of Elmer Grice, Mankato, Minn., and 35 other citizens of Nicollet County, Minn., opposing House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4152. Also, petition of Martin L. F. Eyrych, New Ulm, Minn., and 25 others, supporting a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4153. Also, petition of H. G. Seifert, Sherburn, Martin County, Minn., and 16 other residents of Martin County, opposing House bill 6465, Box immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4154. Also, petition of R. P. Williams, Judson, Blue Earth County, Minn., and 50 other residents of Blue Earth County, opposing House bill 6465; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4155. Also, petition of Howard P. Sanders, Redwood Falls, Redwood County, Minn., and 80 other citizens of Redwood County, opposing House bill 6465, Box immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4156. Also, petition of J. L. Cummins, Eagle Lake, Blue Earth County, Minn., and 30 other residents of Blue Earth County, opposing House bill 6465, Box immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4157. By Mr. CRAIG: Petition of West Coast Vegetable Association, Peppers Fruit Co., Peter M. Kahn, Valley Fruit & Produce Co., Charles Milnes, N. S. Rivers, American Fruit Growers (Inc.) of California, Rivers Bros. Co., Myers Darling & Hinton Co., Yaqui Fruit Co., Kingsbaker Bros. Co., Bryant

Phillips (Inc.), Morris Trubin, Randolph Marketing Co., protesting against the increasing tariff duties on fresh vegetables of high perishable nature; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4158. Also, petition of approximately 5,784 citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., against the passage of House bill 78, or similar legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4159. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., against the passage of House bill 78, or any other similar legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4160. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., for the relief of the permanently disabled emergency officers of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4161. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., against the passage of the Brookhart bill (S. 1667); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4162. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., against the passage of House bill 78, or similar legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4163. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition signed by C. H. Schuckert and 19 other residents of Bad Axe, Mich., urging passage of Senate bill 1667 and a similar House bill, known as the Cannon bill, which provide for the prohibiting of blind and block booking in the motion-picture industry and the unfair attempt to monopolize this industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4164. Also, petition signed by Carl Borek, of Kingston, Mich., and seven other residents of the vicinity, protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4165. Also, petition signed by Elizabeth E. Drouillard and 41 other residents of Fair Haven, Mich., urging increased pension for veterans and widows of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4166. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of citizens of the third California district, against the Brookhart bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4167. Also, petitions of several thousand citizens of the third district of California, against the House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4168. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of the Unitarian Intercollegiate Conference for New England and New York, against the big Navy bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4169. By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: Petition of citizens of Flagstaff, Ariz., protesting against the passage of the Lankford bill, known as the compulsory Sunday observance law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4170. By Mr. EVANS of California: Petition of R. L. Hines and approximately 5,000 others, against compulsory Sunday closing; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4171. Also, petition of Joseph J. Hilsdorf and approximately 5,026 others against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4172. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Marang, of route 4, Bozeman, Mont., and other residents of Bozeman protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4173. Also, petition of Pearl K. Fey and other residents of Eureka, Mont., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4174. By Mr. FAUST: Petition signed by many citizens of St. Joseph, Mo., favoring increased pensions for Civil War veterans and their survivors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4175. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of American Writing Paper Co., Holyoke, Mass., protesting against enactment of Senate bills 1752 and 1686 and House bill 7747, all relating to the regulation of the manufacture and sale of envelopes with postage stamps embossed thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4176. By Mr. GARBER: Letter of Henry Lovell, of Mooreland, Okla., in regard to farm relief; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4177. Also, letter of San Juan Camp No. 2 of Enid, Okla., by J. O. Hocker, adjutant, in support of Senate bill 1199, in regard to the erection of a Roosevelt memorial; to the Committee on the Library.

4178. Also, letter of H. L. Hawood, secretary Post A, Virginia Division, Travelers' Protective Association of America, in Richmond, Va., in support of House bill 5588; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4179. Also, letter of J. W. Mann, president of Oklahoma Branch, Associated General Contractors, of Oklahoma City, Okla., in support of House bill 5772, in re day-labor method; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4180. Also, resolution of Dixie Post, No. 64, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in support of Senate bill 2302 and House bill 8560; to the Committee on Pensions.

4181. Also, letter of A. G. Moore, 312 West Twenty-fourth Street, Oklahoma City, Okla., representing the members of the Railway Mail Association in Oklahoma, in support of House bill 25; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

4182. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of residents of Bellingham, Wash., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4183. By Mr. HALL of North Dakota: Petition of 13 citizens and radio owners of North Dakota, against the present broadcasting chain of sending stations; also that any station which has been operating for one year previous to the passage of the 1927 law shall be construed as one serving public necessity and convenience; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

4184. Also, resolution by the Rugby Community Club, Rugby, N. Dak., protesting against the proposal to change the present standard of macaroni wheat and insisting that the definition of macaroni wheat products read as "farina, the purified middlings of winter and spring wheat (durum wheat excluded); semolina, the purified middlings of durum wheat"; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

4185. By Mr. HARDY: Petition of 263 citizens of Rocky Ford, Colo., and La Junta, Colo., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4186. Also, petition of 24 citizens of Pueblo, Colo., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4187. By Mr. HOFFMAN: Petition of Robert E. Watkins and others of Monmouth County, N. J., urging increase of pension for Civil War widows and Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4188. Also, petition of James H. Johnson and others, of Seabright, N. J., urging increase of pension for Civil War widows and Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4189. Also, petition of Howard L. Smith and others, of Ocean Grove, N. J., urging increase of pension for Civil War widows and Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4190. Also, petition of Elizabeth Wiley and others, of Lakewood, N. J., urging increase of pension for Civil War veterans and widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4191. By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of T. E. Glenn and numerous other residents of Jefferson County, Ala., in opposition to House bill 78, the District of Columbia Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4192. By Mr. HUDSPETH: Petition of citizens of Mertens and Hillsboro, Tex., indorsing House bill 5581, to prevent the gambling in cotton futures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4193. By Mr. IRWIN: Petition of B. B. Bayless, of River Grove, Ill., urging the early consideration in the House of Representatives of House bill 500; to the Committee on Rules.

4194. By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: Petition of citizens of Rochester, N. Y., protesting against pending legislation for increased naval armament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4195. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by 47 voters of the tenth congressional district of Ohio, protesting against the construction of a big Navy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4196. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of G. A. Chalupnik, of Trinity, Tex., favoring and urging passage of House bills 25, 55, 88, 89, 9058, 9059, 9585, and 9766, relative to Postal Service employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4197. Also, petition of C. V. Sitton, of Houston, Tex., favoring and urging passage of House bills 55, 88, 9502, and 9766, relative to Postal Service employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4198. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of Mrs. E. U. Meier and 6 others, residents of Marshall, Mich., urging to bring to vote a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4199. Also, petition of F. E. Haif and 46 other residents of Vermontville, Mich., protesting against the naval program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

4200. By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Petition signed by Mrs. C. W. Bisland and some twoscore other women of Fremont, Nebr., praying for a better understanding between our own United States Government and the peoples of sister republics to the south of us and in the Orient, asking for investigation

and revision of international law on more just and Christian principles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4201. By Mr. KEARNS: Petition of citizens of Portsmouth, Ohio, urging a vote on the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4202. Also, petitions signed by citizens of Scioto County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of any bill to regulate Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4203. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of Dr. W. N. Yeager and 29 other residents of Berrien Springs, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4204. Also, petition of 146 residents of Allegan, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4205. By Mr. KINDRED: Resolution of the Republican Club of Astoria, indorsing House bill 6506, known as the O'Connell night work bill, and urging the United States Congress to secure immediate passage of this legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4206. By Mr. KORELL: Petition of citizens of Portland, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4207. By Mr. LEA: Petition of 150 residents of Mill Valley, Calif., protesting against House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4208. By Mr. LEAVITT: Petition of various Montana communities, in opposition to compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4209. By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of citizens of New York, urging the passage of the House bill 6518, known as the Welch bill, and House bill 492, introduced by Mr. LEHLBACH; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

4210. By Mr. LETTS: Petition of A. F. Nelson and other citizens of Davenport, Iowa, protesting against the passage of a Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4211. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Admiral Schley Naval Squadron, No. 16, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging support of House bill 6523, providing certain allowances for retired enlisted men of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4212. Also, petition of Messrs. Lester Krappen, Joseph Ruggilo, and Joseph Brennan, World War veterans suffering with tuberculosis, urging favorable action on House bill 8228, with particular reference to presumptive clause therein; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4213. By Mr. McREYNOLDS: Petition of the voters of Cleveland, Bradley County, Tenn., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4214. By Mr. MADDEN: Petition of approximately 1,200 citizens of the county of Cook, State of Illinois, urging the passage of the Welch bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

4215. By Mr. MAPES: Petition of 30 residents of Grand Rapids, Mich., advocating the enactment of additional legislation for the benefit of veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4216. Also, petition of 181 residents of Grand Rapids, Mich., against the enactment of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4217. By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of sundry citizens of Bethel, Conn., urging the passage of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4218. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of Seattle, Wash., in favor of increase in pensions for veterans and widows of Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4219. Also, petition of citizens of Seattle, Wash., protesting passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4220. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of citizens of Dona Ana County, N. Mex., and M. L. Higgins and others, protesting against House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4221. Also, petition of J. M. Penfield and other residents of Lincoln, N. Mex., indorsing the Welch bill (H. R. 6518); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

4222. By Mr. NELSON of Maine: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by some 32 residents of Norridge-

wock and Madison, Me.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4223. Also, petition from sundry residents of Fairfield, Me., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4224. Also, petition from sundry residents of Gardiner, Me., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4225. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance from some 18 residents of Fairfield, Me.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4226. Also, petition of sundry residents of Fairfield, Me., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4227. Also, petition of some 44 residents of Norridgewock, Me., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4228. Also, petition of sundry residents of Norridgewock, Me., against the Lankford bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4229. By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition from the voters of Washington district, Upshur County, W. Va., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill carrying the rates proposed by the National Tribune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4230. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Patriotic Council No. 70, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, Richmond Hill, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 5473; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4231. Also, petition of the Upjohn Co., New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 9195, Cuban parcel post bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4232. Also, petition of the New York Typographical Union No. 6, New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 9575; to the Committee on Printing.

4233. Also, petition of Seabury & Johnson, of New York City, favoring the passage of the Cuban parcel post bill (H. R. 9195); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4234. Also, petition of the Dixie Post, No. 64, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, favoring the passage of Senate bill 2302 and House bill 8560; to the Committee on Pensions.

4235. Also, petition of the Admiral Schley Naval Squadron, No. 16, United Spanish War Veterans, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 6523, for an increase in the allowances granted retired enlisted men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4236. Also, petition of the Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., Rochester, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Cuban parcel post bill (H. R. 9195); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4237. Also, petition of E. R. Squibb & Sons, New York, favoring the passage of the Cuban parcel post bill (H. R. 9195); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4238. Also, petition of Charles Swanton, of Beacon, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Mead bill (H. R. 8228) extending the presumptive clause; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4239. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition against the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78), signed by Alice G. Kinney and about 200 adult citizens of Waterloo, Black Hawk County, Iowa; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4240. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of Mrs. H. P. Monroe and 26 other citizens of Rochester, N. Y., protesting against the large Navy program now being considered; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

4241. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of A. Wickham and 32 residents of Richville, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any bill that will in any way give preference to one religion above another; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4242. Also, petition of Leo B. Hassler and 66 adult residents of Perham, Minn., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or of any other compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4243. By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Petition of A. C. Irvine and 67 other citizens of Enterprise, Kans., protesting against the passage of the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4244. By Mr. SWING: Petition of citizens of San Bernardino, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4245. Also, petition of citizens of Arlington, Calif., and other communities protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4246. Also, petition of citizens of Fullerton, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4247. Also, petition of citizens of La Habra, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4248. Also, petition of citizens of Hemet and San Jacinto, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4249. Also, petition of citizens of Mount Signal, Calif., and other communities, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4250. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition of numerous citizens of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sabbath legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4251. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sabbath legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4252. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of 20 citizens of Moulton, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4253. By Mr. WATSON: Resolution passed by the Dixie Post, No. 64, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, favoring House bill 8560; to the Committee on Pensions.

4254. By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: Petition granting an increase of pension to Civil War veterans and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4255. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition by Harry L. Walker, of the Federal Custodian Service Association, San Francisco, Calif., containing 55 signatures, favoring the passage of the Welch bill (H. R. 6518), to reclassify and increase salaries of United States Federal employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

4256. By Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri: Petition of Margaret Head, Zoa Bequette, and Ferdinand Boyer, who urge that a vote be taken on the Civil War pension bill carrying rates proposed by the National Tribune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4257. By Mr. YON: Petition of Laura Chason and 39 other citizens of Sopchoppy, Fla., urging that the pension of Civil War veterans be increased; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4258. Also, petition of W. P. Moore and other citizens of Cantonment, Fla., protesting against the passage of the Lankford Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4259. By Mr. WOOD: Protest of C. J. Laurimore, of Lafayette, Ind., against the enactment into law of House bill 78, known as the Lankford bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

TUESDAY, February 21, 1928

The Chaplain, Rev. Z^cBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, Who art the fountain of all grace, the source of all wisdom and goodness, give unto us Thy servants the increase of faith, hope, and love that led by Thy spirit we may find our work a joy, and count all labor light that is undertaken out of love toward Thee. Thou knowest our frame, Thou rememberest that we are but dust. Intensify, therefore, our faith in spite of our frailty, flash upon our inadequacy the sunbeam of hope, and set the bow of Thy love in the cloud of our life, a token of a covenant between heaven and earth, spirit and matter, the warrant of our divine sonship through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Blaine	Broussard	Couzens
Barkley	Blease	Bruce	Curtis
Bayard	Borah	Capper	Cutting
Bingham	Bratton	Caraway	Dale
Black	Brookhart	Copeland	Deneen

Dill	Heflin	Nye	Steiwer
Edwards	Howell	Oddie	Stephens
Ferris	Johnson	Phipps	Swanson
Fess	Jones	Pine	Thomas
Fletcher	Kendrick	Pittman	Tydings
Frazier	King	Ransdell	Tyson
Gerry	La Follette	Reed, Pa.	Wagner
Gillett	McKellar	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mass.
Glass	McLean	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Gooding	McMaster	Sackett	Warren
Greene	McNary	Schall	Waterman
Hale	Mayfield	Sheppard	Watson
Harris	Moses	Shipstead	Wheeler
Harrison	Neely	Shortridge	Willis
Hawes	Norbeck	Simmons	
Hayden	Norris	Smoot	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. Petitions and memorials are in order.

ORDER FOR TO-MORROW'S SESSION, ETC.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, before we proceed with the morning business, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business of the Senate to-day it shall adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, that at the conclusion of the reading of Washington's Farewell Address to-morrow the Senate shall adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon Thursday, and that immediately following the conclusion of the routine morning business on Thursday the Senate shall devote the remainder of the morning hour to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TAX REFUNDS (S. DOC. NO. 60)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in compliance with Senate Resolution 110 (agreed to January 27, 1928; by Mr. HEFLIN), a list by States of the names of persons to whom taxes have been refunded, amounting in each case to \$25,000 or more, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. DENEEN presented a resolution adopted by the ninth annual convention of the American Legion, reaffirming its support of the immigration act of 1924 and of its fundamental national-origin provision that immigrant quotas should be based on the entire population and not on the foreign-born only, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by the Broome County (N. Y.) Bar Association, favoring the passage of legislation to relieve congested calendars in the Federal courts, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BINGHAM presented petitions of American Legion Auxiliaries, Unit No. 45, of Meriden; Unit No. 91, of Moosup; and Rau-Locke Post, No. 8, of Hartford, in the State of Connecticut, praying for adoption of the proposed enlarged naval building program, so as to insure an adequate national defense, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented memorials of the Hartford (Conn.) Branch of the General Alliance of Unitarian and other liberal Christian women, and of 35 citizens of Cheshire, in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against adoption of the proposed enlarged naval building program, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Connecticut Forestry Association, indorsing pending legislation to facilitate research into methods of forest production and conservation, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a letter from the Connecticut Nurserymen's Association, expressing the attitude of that organization relative to certain phases of House bill 9290, the so-called postal rate bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Buckingham Council, No. 14, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Norwich, Conn., protesting against repeal of the national origins provision of the existing immigration law, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a memorial from Lodge No. 37 of the Danish Brotherhood of America, at Bridgeport, Conn., remonstrating against retention of the national origins provision of the existing immigration law and favoring a quota distribution based on the census of 1890, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.